
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc MILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/D/19/3229433

50 Greenways, Winchcombe, Gloucestershire GL54 5LQ

- 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 & Mrs Matthew and Laura Hirons against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00159/FUL, dated 08 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 08 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first floor extension over garage to front'.
-

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 and the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached dwelling positioned at the end of a cul-de-sac in a residential area of Winchcombe. The cul-de-sac comprises of a mix of property types including detached dwellings and bungalows, characterised by large open front gardens.
4. The appeal proposal is for a first-floor extension to the existing garage at the front of the property. The proposal would protrude beyond the existing garage walls at both the front and sides. When viewed from the front this would make the proposed extension seem unbalanced and top heavy. It would be an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, and as such it would fail to respect the character of the existing property.
5. The proposal would be clad with timber feather board, which would contrast with the existing brickwork of the host property. Whilst there is a mixture of property types within the cul-de-sac, they are all finished with similar coloured brickwork. The proposed cladding material for the extension would therefore fail to respect the existing street scene and would cause harm to the appearance of the area.
6. It was evident from my site visit that the host property is set back from the neighbouring property at No 48. The appellant states that due to its position the property is currently dwarfed and hidden by the two storey elements of this

neighbouring property. Because of this set back, the appellant considers that the size bulk and scale of the proposal is appropriate when taken in this context. However, I do not find that the set back distance between the two properties results in any undue harm. Any benefit of introducing a first-floor extension at the host dwelling is outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of both the host building and surrounding area.

7. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling. As such it conflicts with policies 5.1 and 5.5 of the Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Plan, policy HOU8 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan, policy SD4 of the Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies, amongst other things, seek that new development should be of a high quality and respect the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
8. The appellant has indicated that additional space is required for their growing young family, and the proposed extension would provide additional space for family members to assist in childcare services. The appellant has explored moving to a larger property and state the cost of this is prohibitive. However, no substantive evidence of this has been provided by the appellant and I can only afford this little weight in favour of the proposals. Whilst I have given these personal circumstances careful consideration, little weight can be attached to such personal circumstances. The harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area is at odds with the development plan and is a matter of significant weight against the proposal.
9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR