



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2022

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/22/3303182

9 Appleton Way, Hucclecote, Gloucester GL3 3RP

- 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 and Mrs Steve and Sharon Watkin against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00458/FUL, dated 3 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front/side extension. Single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and
 - Whether the proposal makes adequate provision for vehicular parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site lies at the end of a short cul-de-sac but is clearly visible from the surrounding area and is viewed within the context of the surrounding development. These surrounding dwellings, while predominantly two storeys in height, have somewhat modest proportions and are not overly large, which creates an attractive streetscene. This is reinforced by the spacious nature of the plots within which the buildings are positioned.
4. The appeal scheme seeks to construct a two storey addition to the side, with a projecting extension to the front of the dwelling and single storey attached double garage. The combination of the projecting front extension and attached garage would result in an addition that appears disproportionately large in comparison to the existing dwelling, as well as in comparison to the other nearby dwellings. It would be an overly bulky projection that would be visually dominant in views of the site. As a consequence, notwithstanding that the ridge of the forward extension would be set below that of the main house and that there is no definitive building line visible within the cul-de-sac, the extension would be an incongruous and discordant addition to the location, sitting uncomfortably alongside the proportions of the host property.

5. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, it conflicts with policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (adopted 2017) (the Core Strategy) and policy A9 of the emerging Gloucester City Plan (the City Plan), insofar as they seek to ensure that development responds positively to a site and its surroundings and that extensions to dwellings are in keeping with the scale and character of existing dwellings. The scheme would also conflict with the guidance of the Gloucester City Council - Home Extension Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Parking

6. The proposed extension would occupy an area to the front of the dwelling that is currently utilised as an area for car parking. The appellant submits that the appeal scheme provides the required three parking spaces, one as a space within the frontage of the dwelling and a further two within the proposed double garage. However, given the propensity for garages to be utilised for other purposes than parking, i.e., storage, I find that the parking provision would be below the required three spaces.
7. However, I am mindful that the Council has suggested a planning condition, should I be minded to allow the appeal, that would require details of three parking spaces to be submitted for approval. I am also conscious that the appellant has submitted with the appeal details of these parking spaces, which in my view provide adequate off-street parking and would avoid any conflict with the parking arrangements of neighbouring properties.
8. As such, I consider that subject to a suitably worded planning condition, adequate off-street parking could be provided within the site and therefore, subject to this, the scheme would not result in any unacceptable effect on highway safety. Thus, I find no conflict with policies INF1 and SD4 of the Core Strategy, or policy A9 of the City Plan. Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development incorporates safe access as well as appropriate parking provision, and that a site is large enough to accommodate a development.

Other Matters

9. I note that the proposed extensions are intended to help accommodate elderly relatives and thus there would be social benefits to the appellants. However, I am also conscious that a previously approved scheme would provide additional accommodation and the appeal scheme seeks to enlarge this. However, given the existence of an approved scheme, the benefits that would accrue to the appellant are not sufficient in this case to overcome the harm that I identify.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR