
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/W/19/3231191

Land adjacent to 117 Painswick Road, Gloucester GL4 4PZ

- 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 Richard Castle against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00657/FUL, dated 30 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double garage at land opposite 130 Painswick Road, Gloucester.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. I have adjusted the site address to align with the decision notice for clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed double garage on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site is a corner plot in a residential area. It is in a prominent location. The site is enclosed by a chain-link fence behind a low boundary wall. Access onto the site is gained from Old Painswick Road. This is a 'no through road'. Residential plots near to the site include dwellings on one side and rear gardens on the other. The site is adjacent to a row of brick two-storey semi-detached properties. The row is set back from the highway by around 3.5m. These dwellings are mostly set behind a low wall similar to the appeal site. Consequently, the site makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal consists of a large garage with a hipped roof. The proposed garage would have a vehicle door and separate pedestrian door facing Old Painswick Road and the junction. It would be a tall structure and able to accommodate a motorhome. It would be close to the boundary with Painswick Road.
6. Planning approval was granted 22 December 2016¹ for the erection of a double garage and boundary treatment on the site. The approved development was a

¹ Planning Application Reference: 16/01127/FUL

similar height to that proposed. However, it was set back from Painswick Road and its chamfered rear elevations abutted Old Painswick Road. As a consequence, whilst having a greater effect on Old Painswick Road it presented a relatively complementary relationship with the existing dwellings on the main road and street-scene. In contrast, the proposal would be a dominant and overt addition to the site. It would be substantially beyond the well-defined front building line of the adjacent row of dwellings. It would not therefore blend in with the surrounding street-scene.

7. The proposal would be highly visible from the main road when travelling in either direction. Its additional height and general bulk would result in a structure that would not be read as a conventional domestic garage. This effect would be exacerbated by the prominent nature of the site. I have considered the use of conditions to provide screening and mitigate the harm. However, due to the scale and location of the proposal, screening could not capably or adequately mask the proposal. In any event, development should be of good design; generally negating the need to be screened by landscaping. As such, the proposed garage would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would not accord with policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2017, which seeks development that responds positively to, and respects, the character of the site and its surroundings.

Other matters

9. In regard to highway safety, both the approved and proposed layouts present limited on-site turning areas. The appellant states that the approved scheme would require an access onto Painswick Road to function and this might raise a highway objection from the Council. However, this has not been formally tested. In any event, the stated difficulty of the approved scheme and resultant awkward manoeuvring on site would not outweigh the harm caused by the proposal to the street scene.
10. The appellant has offered to amend the plans to reduce its impact. However, such an alteration would be materially different, and it is not the purpose of an appeal to evolve a scheme.
11. The appellant has reacted to representations received in objection of the appeal. Matters relating to the sale or otherwise of cars from the site has no bearing on the main issue of this appeal. The proposal would enable some vehicles to park on site, maybe easing pressure on local highways, but this benefit can take place in any event without the proposal. As such, I have afforded limited weight to this suggested benefit.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons the appeal does not succeed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR