



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: 31st October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/22/3304956

16 Gatton Way, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL3 3DG

- 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 Ms Jessica Bishop against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
- The application Ref 22/00574/FUL, dated 7 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2022.
- The development proposed is described as "Proposed extension and works to property".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property, which appears as a single storey dwelling with accommodation within the roof space. There is some variety in the properties within the vicinity, with some possessing flat-roof dormer elements to the front roofscape, giving the appearance of two storey properties. Many nearby properties have been extended with rear and side extensions.
4. The appeal scheme seeks to extend the property through the addition of a single storey rear extension, a flat roof dormer extension to the rear and a two-storey side extension. The rear dormer extension would stretch across the entire rear roof plane as well as wrapping around the side elevation of the property. In this respect, it would be an overly large addition, that fails to respond appropriately to the scale and form of the existing dwelling.
5. While there are no public views of the rear elevation, the addition would nonetheless be visible from surrounding properties and their outdoor spaces. Additionally, the element that wraps around to the side elevation of the property would be clearly visible from the street. In such views, it would be an inharmonious feature, jarring with the appearance of the existing building.
6. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the proposal 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, insofar as they seek to ensure that

development responds positively to a site and its surroundings, as well as 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.

7. I have been referred to policy SD14 of the Core Strategy, however this appears to be related to health and environmental quality, with a focus on human health. No specific conflict with this policy has been identified. Nonetheless, this does not diminish the conflict with the policies I have identified above.

Other Matters

8. I am conscious of the examples of other extensions to which my attention has been drawn by the appellant. However, I find that these are generally more sympathetically designed and discretely located. As such, they have little bearing on my decision.
9. I am also aware that the proposals are intended to facilitate improvements to the property for the occupiers. However, there is nothing before me that convinces me that the extensions as currently proposed are the only means of delivering such improvement. This does not persuade me therefore that the appeal should be allowed.
10. Within the statement of case the appellant refers to revised drawings that are requested to be considered as part of the appeal. However, these have not been provided. In any event, I have made my decision on the basis of the plans considered by the Council. Should the appellant wish to amend the scheme, these details should be considered by the Council in the first instance.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR