
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/19/3236471
22 Charlton Way, Gloucester GL2 0DY

- 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 R Walsh against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00390/FUL, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is for extensions and alterations to bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A number of revised plans of development were submitted to Council during the application process. The amendments included the removal of a sub-station from the plans that no longer exists, addition of external material details, and a reduction in length to the proposed front extension. To remove any doubt, I have had regard to the following plans in my determination of this appeal: Survey Drawing (Dwg No 19 13 01A, dated 24/06/2019); Planning Proposals (Dwg No 19 13 02C, dated 19/07/2019).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a bungalow located towards the end of Charlton Way. Charlton Way is a cul-de-sac road which is characterised by a regular pattern of bungalow and semi-detached dwellings with a uniformed end gable roof appearance and distinct building line throughout the street scene. The appeal property adjoins Kenton Drive to the south, which is an unconstructed road accessible off of Innsworth Lane. The site is not directly accessible from Kenton Drive and as such has little physical relationship within this street scene.
5. Both the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling at 20 Charlton Way are setback from the predominant building line within the street scene, due to the turnaround area at the end of the street. Despite this, the siting and design of these dwellings maintains a consistent appearance with the wider street scene

and serves as a logical extension to the pattern of development as it progresses towards the end of Charlton Way.

6. The proposed front extension would introduce a prominent feature which would appear discordant with the consistent design replicated throughout the street scene. This is particularly evident when considering the existing relationship with neighbouring property No 20, which shares a mirrored appearance with the appeal site. Although the appeal site is located at the end of the cul-de-sac it remains a unifying part of the collective street scene and as such the proposal would be harmful to this distinct character and appearance.
7. I appreciate the appellants' desire to modernise the internal layout of the existing dwelling and to utilise their front garden to facilitate this. However, any such extensions or alterations needs to have regard to the predominant character and appearance established by the host dwelling, adjoining properties and throughout the street scene.
8. Accordingly, the proposed extensions and alterations to the bungalow would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (adopted December 2017) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure development achieves high quality design which responds positively to and respects the character of the site and surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. The appellants' statement of case documents correspondence from the Council discussing the events which lead to the refusal of planning permission. Although regrettable, the discussion and delays experienced through this process do not fall within the scope of the appeal. I have therefore determined the appeal on its merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR