



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2023

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/22/3305885
136 Seymour Road GLOUCESTER GL1 5HR

- 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 Peter Montgomery against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00417/FUL dated 18 April 2022 was refused by notice dated 07 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and first floor side extension at 136 Seymour Road GLOUCESTER GL1 5HR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 22/00417/FUL dated 18 April 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 00906A-06 rev.A, 00906A-07 rev.B, and 00906A-08 rev.A.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the submission of this appeal Gloucester City Council have adopted The Gloucester City Plan 2011-2031 (City Plan) which is in consequence comprised in the Development Plan for the appeal site. I have made the decision on that basis.
3. The description of development used by the Council differs slightly from that given on the application form; without prejudice to either party and in the interests of clarity and I have used that appearing on the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site, 136 Seymour Road (No. 136) is a two-storey semi-detached house set in a wide plot and deep garden within a residential area close to the

centre of the City which exhibits a variety of house designs contributing to a varied but generally homogenous street scene.

6. The proposal would involve building over the side parking area in proximity to the boundary with its non-attached neighbour, No.138, leaving a gap between the properties. It is also intended to widen and extend the rear two-storey outrigger at ground floor level. What is proposed at the rear would not be inconsistent with the varied rear extensions found on other similar properties including the adjoining neighbour, No.134. In that regard the proposal at the rear would be contained by the street frontage and not obtrusive.
7. The Council conclude the proposal would have no unacceptable impacts upon the amenity, outlook and privacy of neighbouring users, and this is consistent with my observations, but they consider that the proposal would, by virtue of its width, be harmful to the character and appearance of the area by reference to the Gloucester City Council Home Extensions Guide SPD (Extensions SPD).
8. The Extensions SPD has been retained as interim planning guidance for the purposes of decision-taking and embodies a number of well-understood urban design principles in terms of the need for extensions to be subservient to the host dwelling and to achieve a consistency of visual presentation. It also seeks to avoid such extensions appearing 'cramped or awkward in the street scene'. The proposed side extension, as the officer report acknowledges, is set back from the main frontage and with a lower ridge height but does fill the remaining width of the plot; this is a consequence of the decision to retain parking beneath, an appropriate functional constraint on the design if no visual harm arises, a matter to which I now turn.
9. Whilst the pattern of development in proximity to the junction with Tuffley Avenue (to the south) is mixed in terms of plot size and frontage permeability, Seymour Road to the north and opposite the site is characterised by a consistent and tightly configured frontage of traditional early-twentieth or late-nineteenth century dwellings. Whilst the proposal would largely infill the existing gap at the side of No.136, this would still leave space between it and the flank wall of No.138 of a size not inconsistent with that found between pairs of houses or terrace blocks in other parts of the street. Overall the degree of change in the street scene would be modest and the insertion proposed would tend to reinforce the traditional development pattern in the street where views to the rear are largely absent.
10. I conclude there would be no conflict with Policy A9 of the City Plan, Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017) or the provisions set out in the Gloucester City Council Home Extensions SPD which together seek to ensure alterations to existing dwellings do not impair the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
11. In consequence, having considered all matters raised and for the reasons given the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing conditions.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR