



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/20/3263385

232 Stroud Road, Gloucester GL4 0AU

- 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 Mark Winterbourn against the decision of Gloucester City Council
 - The application Ref 20/00668/FUL, dated 17 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition and replacement of single storey extension, First Floor Extension and Dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal site is an attractive two storey detached dwelling, located on Stroud Road, a lengthy and busy arterial road characterised by detached dwellings of varying scale and character.
5. The proposed extension would replace the existing single storey projection. Its flat roof would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the existing pitched main roof. It would also, when viewed from either side, sit awkwardly above the existing first floor rear eaves line. Given the separation gap between properties, the extension would be visible from the highway in addition to being visible from both neighbouring properties.
6. Whilst the extension would not extend the existing footprint of the dwelling and would be finished in appropriate materials, the addition of a substantial rear dormer would result in a bulk and massing that would overwhelm the host property and its original form and character would not be readily apparent.
7. It is noted that the neighbouring property, No 234, is extensively extended, however no details are provided of this planning approval and as such it is not possible to make a direct comparison, which limits the weight which I can

attach to this case in my recommendation. Moreover, the neighbouring dwelling does not appear to be similar in appearance, and the visible rear extensions extend the existing gable, unlike what is proposed under this appeal. Furthermore, each case is determined on its own merits, particularly with regards to considerations of impact upon the character and appearance of individual dwellings.

8. It is acknowledged that the planning application did not receive any objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, this is a neutral factor which does not alter my conclusions on the main issue.
9. I conclude therefore that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property. This would be in conflict with Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2017), Policy A9 of the emerging Gloucester City Plan 2011 - 2031 (2019) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Home Extension Guide' (2008), which collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard and that rear extensions are subservient and in keeping with the original property. These policies are in broad conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR