



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 October 2021

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/21/3279275

191 Barnwood Road, Gloucester, GL4 3HN

- 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 Miss Bethany Lock against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00421/FUL, dated 6 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to rear of property. Parapet roof with K-render finish.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Pre-Submission Gloucester City Plan 2011-2031 (Emerging Plan) is yet to be adopted and I have not been provided with details of any unresolved objections to the policy relevant to this appeal. However, as it is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) it carries moderate weight.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. There is a mix of housing styles and materials along Barnwood Road. Nevertheless, while there are some differences between the appeal property and the attached one, there is a strong consistency of materials, features and a general symmetry to the pair that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. This includes a single storey rear outbuilding with a pyramid roof and central chimney stack that spans both properties.
5. The proposed extension would not extend further beyond the side elevation of the dwelling than the existing single storey element that already has a small parapet roof. The extension would mostly be screened from the street by boundary treatments and other properties.
6. Nevertheless, the proposed scheme, albeit with a parapet roof around, would introduce an uncharacteristically large flat roof element at odds with the typically sloping roofs at the appeal property and the one attached to it. The

use of render would also unfavourably contrast with the brick that is the predominant material at the appeal site and draw attention to the incongruity of the extension with the existing built form. This would be obvious from adjacent properties.

7. Although single storey, given its footprint and as it would extend across the whole of the rear elevation, the extension would dominate the rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension would also wrap around the pyramid outbuilding and extend above its eaves. This would result in the proportions and appearance of this feature being lost.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy SD4 of the JCS¹, Policy A.9 of the Emerging Plan and the SPD² where they require schemes to be of a scale, design and external materials appropriate to, and in keeping with the existing dwelling and locality.
9. It would also be contrary to the Framework where it states schemes should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. I note comments regarding the condition of the existing property and that improvements have already been made to it by the appellant. The proposed extension would bring about improvements to the property including to drainage and insulation. These matters weigh in favour of the scheme. Nonetheless, it has not been shown that the proposed extension is the only method of achieving this and there is limited detailed evidence showing the extent of the improvements.
11. It has been suggested that the extension comes within the size requirements for the dwelling. There is no certificate of lawful development before me to demonstrate that the scheme is permitted development or that there is a fallback position that would create similar or greater harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. That there have been no objections to the proposal from neighbouring properties is not a reason in itself to allow development that is otherwise unacceptable. The conduct of the council during the application and prior to the appeal do not affect my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

13. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
14. I have found that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, being contrary to Policy SD4 of the JCS, Policy A.9 of the Emerging Plan, the SPD and the Framework.

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

² Home Extension Guide Interim Adoption Supplementary Planning Document

15. I am sympathetic to the needs of the appellant and their desire to provide improved accommodation for their family. However, I am unable to conclude that the appeal scheme would be the only solution to meeting the appellant's requirements, or that the harm could be overcome by imposing planning conditions. This reduces the weight I afford to the benefit arising from the proposal.
16. Moreover, given that the planning system operates in the wider public interest which has legitimate aims of upholding the purposes of planning policies, the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue outweighs these personal matters, and others that weigh in favour of the scheme and it is a proportionate and justifiable reason to dismiss the appeal.
17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
18. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR