
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2019

by I Bowen BA(Hons) BTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/19/3223480

21 Knollys End, Quedgeley, Gloucester GL2 4YN

- 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 Sean Adams against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01445/FUL, dated 11 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is dormer to front of property to extend bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Knollys End is a cul-de-sac forming part of a larger formally laid out housing estate. There is some variation in the design and type of houses in the street, with mainly two-storey terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings. However, there is also consistency in the use of red brick, concrete roof tiles and dwellings being set back a short distance from the highway.
4. The appeal property forms one of a terrace of four dwellings. The properties are two-storey to the rear but present single-storey elevations to the front, giving rise to an asymmetrical roof profiles with a steeply sloping pitch to the front.
5. The adjoining end-terrace dwelling has a side extension incorporating a second storey window to the front elevation. Nevertheless, there is otherwise a high degree of uniformity in the terrace with a continuous tiled roof spanning the properties which lacks adornments or detailing other than rooflights. This consistency is mirrored at ground floor level with front porch projections, a straight building line and driveways to the front.
6. The proposal is to install a front roof extension to create a dormer and suitable materials could be used to match those of the host property. However, the structure would feature a sloping roof to meet the ridgeline and would project forwards to a point almost in line with the eaves. Consequently, whilst it would not span the full width of the property, it would nevertheless be a large, boxy

extension out of proportion with the existing building and would be a prominent new feature on the otherwise uniform roof structure of the terrace.

7. Given the scale, design and location of the proposal, I consider it would result in a dominant form development which is not a characteristic of the surrounding properties. As such it would be a discordant feature in the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, this terrace of properties is orientated face-on at the head of the cul-de-sac and the dwellings are therefore particularly prominent in the street scene. This would compound the harm I have found.
8. I therefore conclude the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011 – 2031. That Policy requires development, amongst other matters, to respond positively to, and respect the character of, the site and its surroundings.
9. It would also fail to accord with the Gloucester Home Extension Guide Interim Adoption Supplementary Planning document which seeks to ensure dormer windows are of an appropriate size and scale to fit comfortably on the roof. The proposal would therefore also not comply with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to other dormer extensions in the locality which, it is contended, are similar to the appeal proposal. I took the opportunity to view those examples on my site visit. However, I have not been provided with any further details and therefore cannot be certain that their circumstances are reasonably comparable. I also observed that those properties are not as prominently sited as No 21 and their roof dormers do not extend from the ridge towards the eaves to the same extent as the appeal proposal.
11. In any event, the extension being proposed is not a characteristic feature of the area and I must consider the merits of the specific proposal before me. The existence of other roof extensions in the area does not justify the harm I have identified.
12. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant and would not affect the living conditions of any neighbouring occupiers. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm the development would cause.
13. The appellant indicated that during the course of the planning application, the Council's planning officer apparently failed to attend a pre-arranged site visit. Whilst I appreciate this caused inconvenience to the appellant, that is a matter between the main parties and does not go to the merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian Bowen

INSPECTOR