
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/D/20/3255264

12b Glebe Road, Prestbury, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL52 3DG

- 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 C Deadman against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00027/FUL, dated 7 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear family room and bedroom extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. While properties in the surrounding area are generally 2 storey, the appeal site is part of a pair of largely symmetrical semi-detached bungalows of a simplistic design and proportions. This results in a particular, if unremarkable character. Along with their small scale and set back from the road, these factors result in the bungalows currently having a discrete presence in the streetscene.
4. Although there is no uniformity to the dwellings in the street, there is a general consistency in the proportions and appearance of individual pairs of properties. The bungalows reflect that at present.
5. The materials and hipped roof of the extension would be in keeping with the surrounding vernacular. It would also be lower than the adjacent 2 storey dwelling. Nonetheless, the height, footprint and forward projection of the extension would result in it overwhelming and dominating the existing single storey property. While the bay window would be retained, the scheme would considerably unbalance the pair of bungalows giving them a disjointed appearance. The appeal property would sit awkwardly in the streetscene assimilating neither with the bungalows nor the 2 storey properties in Glebe Road.
6. The extension would be screened in certain public views by other properties and be at the furthest end of the plot from the road. However, it would be far more prominent than the existing dwelling, being considerably taller than it and would be clearly seen over the existing hedge. While the extension would partly

screen larger commercial and community buildings beyond the site, these are already obscured to some degree by mature vegetation at the appeal site and adjacent gardens.

7. Therefore, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would fail to accord with Policy SD4 of the JCS¹, Policy CP7 of the Local Plan² and the SPD³. These, in part, seek to ensure that developments are subservient, respect, compliment and maintain the character of the site and its surroundings. The scheme would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework where it requires development to be sympathetic to local character.
8. Policy SD8 of the JCS relates to the historic environment. Although included in the refusal reasons, from the details before me the site does not relate to any such assets. Therefore, the policy weighs neither for nor against the proposal.

Other Matters

9. The proposal is said to provide an inclusive and modern family home close to facilities and the property would be more identifiable from the road. However, these are not a justification for setting aside the harm that the proposal would cause.
10. The Council have not included refusal reasons in relation to access, outdoor space, ecology or living conditions. As I have found sufficient harm to dismiss the appeal on other grounds, I do not need to consider these matters further. In any event, the lack of harm is a neutral factor.
11. No detailed information is provided in relation to improved energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy. As such, I afford this little weight. Moreover, while reference has been made to similar developments in the area, none were of the same design and scale as the appeal scheme.
12. I appreciate that pre-application advice was sought and the scheme amended prior to determination to overcome concerns from the Council. Nevertheless, I have found the proposal would result in unacceptable harm.
13. No specific design or certificate of lawful development has been put before me with regards to a suggested rear extension that could be constructed under permitted development rights. Therefore, I cannot be sure that the effects on character and appearance would be comparable to this scheme.

Conclusion

14. Therefore, for the reason above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

¹ Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031

² Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review

³ Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Alterations and Extensions