



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2021 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/D/21/3274060

3 Hetton Gardens, Cheltenham GL53 8HU

- 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 D Boon against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00069/FUL, dated 12 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage and carport, proposed two storey side extension, garage, and general modernisation and facade treatments.
-

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 is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is located on a corner plot, with walls constructed primarily from light coloured bricks. Properties in the vicinity of the appeal site are a mixture of form and scale, though are predominantly light in colour, with some having cladding elements at first floor level.
5. The proposal would use cladding that covers the outside of the property at first floor level. This would be considerably more than the properties in the area that have used honeycomb cladding, which only covers some of the first floor. The use of wood cladding on 7 Hetton Gardens also covers only a portion of the first floor, so it does not contrast with the surrounding area to the same extent as the appeal proposal would. Dormers in the area that have used cladding are much smaller than the proposal and therefore do not have the same disrupting effect.
6. The proposal would use brick slips at ground floor level and dark coloured cladding on the first floor. Properties in the surrounding area, whilst diverse, have a primarily lighter colour. The introduction of two new materials with different colours to the street scene would appear discordant. The use of a large amount of dark coloured cladding at a high level would be at odds with

the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore appear as an incongruous addition to the street scene.

7. The existing property may be in need of renovation and the scale of the extension could be appropriate in this area. However, the proposed development, when considered in its totality, would appear jarring when seen in the context of the surrounding properties. At Vespers, Church Walk, a more contemporary design approach and large amount of dark cladding has been utilised. This property is located in a different context to the appeal property, and it is in a less prominent position. It is therefore not significantly comparable to the appeal proposal.
8. Overall, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy D1 of the Cheltenham Plan (2020), which requires that development should complement and respect the character of the locality. It would also not accord with Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017), which aims to ensure development responds positively to the surroundings, with particular regard to materials that are appropriate to the setting. The proposal would likewise go against the aims of the Cheltenham Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2008), which advises that the character of the setting of a dwelling should influence the use of materials, and that total contrast in the use of materials can produce discord.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has suggested that through permitted development rights, the exterior materials could be changed. Any change in exterior materials would have to be of a similar appearance to the existing materials on the dwelling. The proposed materials, particularly the cladding, would not have a similar appearance to the existing dwelling. They would therefore likely have a more harmful impact on the surrounding area than materials that could be used through permitted development rights.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Max Webb

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.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR