



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/D/22/3298285

2 Guise Avenue, Brockworth, Gloucestershire Gloucester GL3 4NA

- 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 Mrs Rebecca Shearing against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00131/FUL, dated 5 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the Council's decision on the appeal application, the Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 (TBP) has been adopted (June 2022). As a result, Policy RES10 of the adopted TBP replaces the Saved Policy HOU8 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 which was referred to in the Council's decision notice. Both parties have been given the opportunity to provide further comments on the adopted policy.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached house, located on the corner where Guise Avenue splits into two sections. The substantial mature hedge, located on the side boundary of the site, is a prominent feature in the streetscene that helps to softened the appearance of the area.
5. The area is predominantly characterised by detached and semi-detached properties set back from the pavement behind modest gardens and/or parking areas whilst brick walls, hedging and wooden fencing are the prevalent side and rear boundary treatments.
6. The development would extend the host dwelling uncharacteristically up to the side boundary with the pavement at first floor level. It would replace considerably lower and smaller in bulk single storey car port and remove a section of the hedge. Whilst the design and materials of the extension are similar to that of the host dwelling, the significant increase in the bulk would dominate the property.

7. Due to the site's corner location, combined with the scale, bulk and positioning of the extension up to the edge of the pavement, the development would result in a blank, two storey side elevation becoming a prominent feature in the streetscene, visible from several parts of Guise Avenue.
8. Whilst other properties in the area have been extended, these additions are set back from the front elevations and/or with lower ridge and eaves heights than the host dwellings. As none of these examples include two storey extensions positioned directly at the edge of the pavement or located in a prominent part of the streetscene, they are not directly comparable with the appeal proposals.
9. Other hedges nearby may have been removed due to their condition. However, there is no compelling evidence that the hedge on the appeal site is in poor health or that it has affected the car port. Any proposed landscaping would take time to mature and, given the scale and position of the development, it would be unlikely to effectively screen the extension.
10. I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 and RES10 of the TBP which requires, amongst other things, that development, including extensions, should be appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. I do acknowledge that the hedge may be difficult to maintain and its removal beneficial in providing additional space for the occupiers of the property. Whilst the removal of part of the hedge may provide more space for those using the pavement, as the development retains the remainder of the hedge, any benefit to pedestrians would be minimal. These matters, individually or combined, do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
12. Even if I were to consider that the development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, the plot is of sufficient size to accommodate the development and parking, these would be neutral factors and would not weigh in favour of the development.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR