



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2017

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/W/17/3181656

14 Ardmore Close, Gloucester GL4 0BL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Georgina Wood against Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00230/FUL, is dated 6 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is for the removal of existing timber workshop and erection of brick workshop and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of existing timber workshop and erection of brick workshop and garage at 14 Ardmore Close, Gloucester GL4 0BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00230/FUL, dated 6 March 2017, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 14AC-2-E; 14AC-2-N; 14AC-1W; 14AC-1-S; 14AC-2-W; 14AC-1-SPLN; 14AC-1-LPLN; 14AC-1-P; 14AC-2-S; 14AC-1-N; AC-Proposed Garage Floor Plan; 14AC-existing Garage Floor Plan; 14AC-1-E and Site Location Plan.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Procedural matter

2. A revised elevational drawing number 14AC-2-E showing a hipped roof arrangement to the east elevation of the garage/workshop was lodged with the appeal drawings, which appears to differ from the drawing that the Council considered. However, from other plans accompanying both the appeal and application, it is clear that a hipped roof was the architectural form intended. I do not consider that either party has been prejudiced as a result of this slight discrepancy. Accordingly, I have determined this appeal on the basis of a hipped roof design.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Situated at the head of the residential cul de sac, the appeal property stands in a relatively substantial plot in an elevated position above houses opposite and contains a timber workshop situated alongside the host dwelling house. The proposal would see the demolition of the existing timber workshop and its replacement with a brick built structure, which would extend beyond the present building line of No.14.
5. Ardmore Close comprises a mix of detached houses of varying styles and character; the host property is of bespoke design incorporating robust suburban detailing which is very much of its period. The garden area rises sharply to the rear towards dense mature wooded slopes. This wooded area provides a distinctive backdrop to the host property and the rest of the cul de sac. The wooded area also occupies the area of land to the north and side of No.14.
6. In addition to replacing a structure of mediocre design, the proposed garage and workshop would also occupy the area along the side boundary that is currently used for parking. The structure would be sympathetically designed to include facing materials to match the host property and a steeply pitched tiled roof which would assist in providing the necessary enclosure at the end of the cul de sac when viewed from the south. There are no implications arising from the appeal development in terms of height, bulk or massing given the separation distances between No.14 and the properties on the opposite side of the Close.
7. Accordingly, I have found that the proposal would be in keeping with the character and layout of the existing property and its neighbours and thereby comply with Gloucester City Council revised Deposit Local Plan Policies BE.1 and BE.20. These policies combine to require that new developments including extensions to existing properties to sit comfortably within their surroundings in terms of scale, form, massing and height and to be sympathetically designed in relation to the character and appearance of the street scene and neighbouring properties.

Condition

8. In terms of planning conditions, the Council has suggested only the standard condition that relates to the period for commencement of development, which I include to comply with the Planning Act. However, I consider that two further conditions are necessary that controls the materials to be used in the garage workshop in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area and to specify approved drawings in order to provide certainty.
9. Having regard to the above reasons and to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR