



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2023

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons) PGDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/D/23/3314038

**Orchard Bank, Bushcombe Lane, Woodmancote, Cheltenham,
Gloucestershire GL52 9QJ**

- 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 Mark Anderson against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00373/FUL, dated 10 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of two storey side extensions extending across the existing building. New ridge which will increase the existing by 0.8m creating a 30-degree pitch to allow the installation of solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development as this more succinctly describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a modest bungalow located on the southern side of Bushcombe Lane. It includes a gable roof and has a projecting front gable feature. There is a separate detached garage to the side of the dwelling. There are notable gaps between the dwelling and the adjoining neighbours, which provide a sense of space and openness in and around the appeal property, which contributes positively to its overarching character.
5. The existing dwelling encompasses a footprint of approximately 151m². The proposed development would introduce two-storey extensions to each side of the dwelling, equating to an additional 145.5m², which would almost double the footprint of the existing house. The ridge height of the property would also be increased by approximately 0.8m, to accommodate solar panels along the pitch of the roof.
6. The significant increase in size and scale means the modest proportions of the original house would largely be eradicated. The extensions would dwarf the modest character of the existing house, and in turn, would appear overly bulky

and dominant. This domineering impact would be amplified by the extent of fenestration across the property's frontage, as well as the additional bulk arising from the front projecting gable.

7. The extensions would also leave little intervening space between the dwelling and each neighbouring property. In turn, the scheme would appear overly cramped and constrained within its plot, which would detract from the existing sense of space and openness around the dwelling.
8. On account of these factors, the extensive size and scale of the development would harm the existing character of the property. In turn, the development would conflict with Policy RES10 of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan (2011-2031), which says proposals for extensions and alterations to existing dwellings will be permitted, provided that the scale of the proposal is appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
9. The proposal would also conflict with Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017), which says development should respond positively to, and respect the character of the site and its surroundings. Finally, the development would fail to meet the design principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (Framework). In particular, paragraph 130 says that development should be visually attractive and add to the overall quality of an area.

Other Matters

10. I have no information before me to indicate whether or not the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. Nonetheless, the design principles set out in the Framework give a clear reason for refusal in this instance, which means the tilted balance would not apply.
11. A number of supplementary planning documents (SPDs) have been cited by the appellant. However, these SPDs relate to other local authority areas, and would not be applicable to proposals within the Council's administrative area.
12. Whilst I acknowledge the sustainability benefits of the proposed solar panels, this benefit would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling in this instance, nor to the wider area.
13. The appellant has cited a number of other applications and appeals to support its position. Nonetheless, each case must be determined on its own merits. In this instance, the size and scale of the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

14. The development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, that outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR