The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/17/3173488
14 Badger Close, Abbeydale, Gloucester GL4 5EY

- 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 and Mrs Escott-Allen against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
- The application Ref 16/01501/FUL, dated 23 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2017.
- The development proposed is 2 storey extension to provide living room, larger kitchen and 2 no additional bedrooms.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 14 Badger Close (No 14) is an end dwelling amongst a terrace of four, which face a hammerhead. Badger Close is characterised by a range of dwellings including semi-detached houses, bungalows and short terraces, which give it a varied appearance. In terms of layout, the dwellings tend to benefit from generous and open frontages, which give Badger Close an open and spacious character.

4. The building line along both sides of Badger Close is staggered. On the northern side as you travel along to the hammerhead the buildings step closer to the highway with No 14 being one of the closest dwellings to the highway. Despite this the side gable of No 14 is broadly in-line with the front of 12 Badger Close and set in from the pavement behind an area of mature landscaping, which provides relief to the street scene, in keeping with the established open and spacious character of the area.

5. However, because of its siting, immediately to the back of the pavement, and scale in terms of depth, which at approximately 9m is greater than the existing side gable and height of nearly 7m; the proposed extension would result in a substantial side elevation. The side elevation would predominantly comprise a large expanse of brickwork, with minimal articulation and no subordination relative to the existing dwelling. This would result in the proposed extension

being unduly close and overbearing when viewed from the highway and with no relief from the edge of the pavement, it would also appear cramped. The sense of overbearing of the proposed extension would be further exacerbated by its prominent position relative to the hammerhead. The subsequent loss of the landscaping would erode the open and spacious character of the site.

6. Consequently, the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on the generally open and spacious character and appearance of the wider streetscene. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with the aims of Policy BE.20 of the Gloucester Local Plan, Second Stage Deposit Local Plan 2002 and the 'Home Extension Guide' Interim Adoption Supplementary Planning Document, August 2008, which amongst other matters require extensions to respect the character and appearance of the streetscene and ensure that that they do not detract from existing open areas of a site. The proposal would also fail to accord with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to secure high quality design taking account of the different characters of areas.

7. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would not affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. Also, fore and rear garden areas would be retained and sufficient parking can be provided to meet the needs of the dwelling in line with its increased size, as proposed. Nonetheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm arising from the proposal, as identified above.

Other Matters

8. The appellants' have referred me to two other side extensions to dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site. The first, referred to as 'Appendix 3' is located on the corner of The Richmonds and Badger Close. However, although this is located to the back of pavement, it is single storey and subordinate in scale to its host dwelling. Therefore, it is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.

9. The other extension referred to in Appendix 1 and 2, is a two storey side extension, which is at the back of pavement. Whilst I have no detailed information in respect of this, I note that given the modest width of the extension, the existing dwelling was already close to the back of pavement and therefore any change would not have been as significant as that associated with the appeal proposal. In any event, each proposal is considered on its individual merits. Consequently, the presence of other extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site does not affect my decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I dismiss this appeal.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR