



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/22/3307856

35 Mount Pleasant Kingsway Quedgeley GLOUCESTER GL2 2BX

- 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 Chris Matthews against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00763/FUL dated 29 July 2022 was refused by notice dated 27 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to side of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter:

2. Since the submission of this appeal Gloucester City Council have adopted The Gloucester City Plan 2011-2031 which is in consequence comprised in the Development Plan for the appeal site. I have made the decision on that basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site, 35 Mount Pleasant, (No.35) is an end-of terrace two storey dwelling within an extensive residential area of similar housing accessed from a hierarchy of secondary roads and parking courts. The immediate setting of No.35, being a right-angle of two rows of four dwellings represents a corner of a larger rectangular space which is visually dominated by a local road¹ and its broad 'island' junction with Thatcham Avenue.
5. The proposal would add a two-storey side extension such that No.35 would fill the width of its plot, up to and replacing metal railings which identify the side boundary. The result would be a blank gable wall at the back edge of the adjoining pavement, replacing the house's inset side enclosure and screen wall, and, significantly, interrupting the long line of railings that demarcate the edge of the highway for the length of Woodvale. Because of the resulting full plot width this would also remove the planting strip which, although neglected, was

¹ 'Woodvale'

plainly intended to be an opportunity for hedging or similar as a feature of the original layout. Its loss would remove that opportunity.

6. The appellant points to examples of built form in the locality and suggests that there is no consistent build line along Woodvale. This, however, is to ignore the overarching planned approach for the development which, as I read it, is to have a variety of housing types with differing setback but a continuity of frontage in the form of perimeter walls or fences even where there is no car access. Even where flank walls appear in the street scene (for instance at the corner in the last of the images supplied by the appellant), this can be understood in urban design terms as a building which turns a corner in the street whereas the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous interruption of the established boundary treatment.
7. Gloucester City Council Home Extensions SPD (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. Whilst the proposed extension, in itself, would not necessarily conflict with the principles set out in that guidance, it is the effect of the proposal on the wider character and appearance of the area to which I have regard.
8. Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2017 (Core Strategy) requires development to pursue a number of design objectives, including responding positively to an area and respecting local character. These principles also refer to the importance of legibility and identity and the proposal would conflict with these principles in the way I describe. There would also be conflict Policy A9 of the recently adopted Gloucester City Plan which refers to the importance of sites being large enough to accommodate extensions.
9. I have noted the appellant's comments as to the need for accommodation and the desire to remain in the area, but the case that additional accommodation cannot otherwise be provided, or is indeed essential, has not been made. I therefore conclude, taking all matters raised into account and for the reasons given, that the proposal would not accord with the development plan taken as a whole and that in consequence the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR