The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 January 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/W/16/3159726
54 Charlecote Avenue, Tuffley, Gloucester GL4 0TH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr James Hodge against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
- The application Ref 16/00323/FUL, dated 18 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of 1 No 2 bedroom detached house.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. Planning permission has been granted at the appeal site for a two storey side extension,[1] and there is a further permission for an attached dwelling.[2] I have had regard to these planning permissions as they form a valid fallback position.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises the side garden of an end-of-terrace dormer bungalow located on the corner of Charlecote Avenue and Thoresby Avenue. The surrounding area is characterised by similar terraced and semi-detached properties.

5. The proposed development is a detached dormer bungalow which would extend towards Thoresby Avenue. Although the development would reflect the design of other dormer bungalows in the area, it would differ in that it would be detached. The width of the detached bungalow would be narrow in comparison with the adjoining terraced block. Consequently, the proportions would not reflect the established character of the area and the development would appear incongruous and out of place. A narrow, detached dormer bungalow in this prominent corner location would be an uncharacteristic form of development.

[1] Ref 15/00860/FUL granted September 2015
[2] Ref 15/01614/FUL granted January 2016

6. I appreciate that there is an extant planning permission for an attached house at the appeal site and, although slightly smaller in width, it would also be prominently located. However, this would not stand out as an uncharacteristic form of development as it would be attached to the existing terraced block and would blend in with the wider street scene.

7. I saw from my site visit that there is a variety of house types along Charlecote Avenue, but detached houses are not common. The proposal would be out of keeping with the predominate development in the wider area and the detached house would appear cramped due to the limited space available.

8. During my site visit, I looked at the examples of other similar developments on corner plots which have been referred to by the appellant. Whilst I agree that these developments are very similar to the proposal, I consider that they do not represent good design and, in both cases, they have an adverse effect on the street scene. It is not clear from the information before me when these were approved. Consequently, I am unable to determine that the Council is inconsistent in its application of local and national policy. Moreover, the fact that planning permission has been granted for other similar development does not overcome the harm that would result from another such scheme. Overtime this would erode the character and appearance of the wider estate.

9. I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policies H.13 and BE.21 of the Local Plan,[3] which seek to ensure that development would not have an unacceptable effect on the character of the locality or unreasonably affect the amenity of existing residents. The development would not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it seeks to secure high quality design.

10. I note that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and, consequently, relevant policies for the supply of housing are considered out-of-date. However, Policies H.13 and BE.21 are not limited to the supply of housing and are not wholly out-of-date. In any event, although the development would make a very small contribution to the district's housing supply, the harm described above would significantly and demonstrably outweigh this benefit when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector

[3] Gloucester Local Plan: Second Stage Deposit Local Plan 2002