



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by K Townend BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/25/3366882

Smithfields Mobile Home, Elmcote Lane, Cambridge GL2 7AS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms M Curry against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.25/0198/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of replacement mobile home and erection of garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is usually taken from the application form. However, the appeal scheme is for replacement of a mobile home rather than a permanent dwelling. The appeal form reflects the description on the Council's decision notice, and I have evidence of the appellant agreeing to the amended description. I shall, therefore, proceed on the basis of the description as set out in the banner heading above.
3. From the evidence before me there is no dispute between the parties as to the acceptability of the replacement mobile home. Furthermore, the proposed development has commenced. I shall therefore confine my detailed considerations to the garage, and I have dealt with the appeal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a mobile home and a detached garage building. From the evidence before me the garage was single storey with a shallow, mono-pitched, roof but has been extended upwards to form a second storey which includes dormer windows and a pitched roof.
6. The mobile home and garage form part of a group of buildings which include the original dwelling, Smithfield, and a second separate dwelling created from the previous conversion of the garage associated with Smithfield. The buildings are closely related to each other and surrounded by open fields. Nevertheless, the appeal garage is associated with the mobile home, not any of the other dwellings.

7. Policy HC8 of the Stroud District Local Plan, adopted November 2015, (the LP) seeks to ensure that any outbuildings constructed are in keeping with the scale and character of the dwelling, and the site's wider setting and location.
8. The extended garage is two storeys in height whereas the mobile home is only single storey, albeit raised above the ground level. The overall height of the garage, which is a result of the height of the wall plate and the pitched roof, is not in keeping with the scale of the mobile home to which it is associated, even if it is similar in height to the nearby building.
9. The increased roof plate and the pitch of the roof are also materially different in appearance to the mobile home, and the dormer windows introduce features not currently present on the mobile home. Even though the dormers are not prominent from the road they add new features that are not in keeping with the dwelling.
10. The roller shutter door and the simple door and window design would continue to give the building a garage/workshop appearance. However, the appearance of the ground floor would not overcome the harm that results from the overall height of the garage and the addition of the dormer windows which are not in keeping with the scale or character of the associated dwelling and which have resulted in the building not being subservient to the mobile home.
11. Even if the garage is not out of keeping with the wider setting and location it is out of keeping with the scale and character of the mobile home, which is the dwelling with which it is associated. Moreover, that there are larger buildings, and recent development, at the nearby cats and dogs' home would not overcome the policy requirement for the building to be in keeping with the dwelling.
12. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed garage would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and is contrary to the requirements of Policy HC8 of the LP, as detailed above.

Other matters

13. I have been made aware that a separate planning permission has been approved for the replacement mobile home. It is, therefore, not necessary for me to consider a split decision and the whole of the appeal scheme can be dismissed.
14. The evidence also advises that the extension and new roof were constructed following storm damage to the original garage. However, I have no compelling evidence that the building could not have been repaired to the same form and height as before and that the additional height, pitched roof, and dormer windows are necessary, even considering the appellant's motorbike collection and other storage needs.
15. The appeal site lies within the zones of influence for the Severn Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC). However, as an ancillary building the appeal scheme would not result in a net increase in residential accommodation and, therefore, would not likely result in adverse effects upon the integrity of the SAC.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Townsend

INSPECTOR