
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/W/19/3233571

62 Wheatway, Abbeydale, Gloucester GL4 5ER

- 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 Mr & Mrs Ian Andrews against Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00272/FUL, is dated 19 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey and single storey extensions, garage conversion, new drive and garden works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for two storey and single storey extensions, garage conversion, new drive and garden works is refused at 62 Wheatway, Abbeydale, Gloucester GL4 5ER.

Main Issue

2. A delegated report submitted by the Council refers to concerns relating to the siting, scale, mass form and design together with the protrusion forward of the building line and its effect on the site, the street scene and local area. The appellants have had the opportunity to comment on the submissions from the Council and I have taken account of the comments made.
3. I therefore consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Wheatway and Drivemoor in a residential area. The surrounding dwellings are of a mixed design and scale which includes bungalows and detached dwellings. Properties in this area have spacious open frontages, and there is a strong continuous building line for properties on Drivemoor.
5. The appeal proposal is for a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and single storey side extension, garage conversion and new driveway. The two-storey side extension would be of a dual pitch roof design with side facing gable, and the single storey side element would be of a mono-pitch design. The single storey side element extends beyond the existing dwelling by approximately 1.3 metres in line with the existing boundary wall of the site.

6. The proposed two storey side extension is of a considerable size and as such would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. Given the site's prominent corner location the proposal would be readily visible from the public realm and nearby properties. The scale and mass of the proposal would be visually dominant and not in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. There is a strong defined building line along Drivemoor, and the appeal site currently sits well within this. The proposed side extension would project forward of the existing building line of properties on Drivemoor and would be an obtrusive feature on this prominent corner site in views along the street. I note that the appeal site is located lower than the properties on Drivemoor, however this would not lessen the visual impact of the extension projecting beyond this established building line. The proposal therefore fails to respect the existing pattern of development and harms the character and appearance of the area.
8. I note the appellant's reference to an extension at a nearby property on the corner of Hawk Close and Bittern Avenue for a sizeable extension which projects beyond the established building line. I do not know when or why this development was allowed or whether or not the same planning policies were in place when planning permission was approved. I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits and against the most up to date local and national planning policies.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. This is in conflict with Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2017, the Gloucester City Council Home Extension Guide 2008 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively these seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high-quality design which respects the character of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the appellant's need for the proposed development, to provide additional space for a growing family. However, such personal circumstances do not outweigh the planning considerations and the harm I have identified from the proposals. The lack of local objections to the proposal does not influence my decision.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed and planning permission refused.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR