



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2023

APP/G1630/D/23/3328529

9B Beckford Road, Alderton, Tewkesbury, GL20 8NL

- 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 Cotswold Construction 24:7 Ltd against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00240/FUL, dated 8 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first-floor extension and second floor dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Cotswold Construction 24:7 Ltd against Tewkesbury Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - the living conditions of occupiers of 11 Beckford Road, with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site relates to a recently completed 2 storey detached house. The design matches that of its neighbour, No 9A. The rear of the house projects back at ground floor level across the full width of the house and has a flat roof creating a stepped rear elevation that breaks up its mass. At first floor level there is a pitched roof above one of the bedroom windows which projects out from the roof plane.
5. The proposed first floor extension would be above the rear projecting ground floor element and its roof would join that of the main house creating a catslide section of roof. The rear dormer would extend across most of the roof width and as such would dominate it. The stepped appearance of the rear elevation and

the symmetry with No 9A would be lost. In combination, the rear extension and dormer would appear bulky and unsympathetic to the original design of the house and its neighbour. I note that No 15 has a rear dormer but it does not extend across most of the roof, as is the case with the appeal proposal. Elsewhere in the area surrounding the appeal site the rear roofscape remains mainly unaltered.

6. Although the proposed development would not be visible from the street, because of the configuration of roads nearby it would be visible from the rear of adjacent properties and houses on Willow Bank Road and Ellenor Drive from which it would appear incongruous and thus harm the character of the area and conflict with Policy SD14 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2017), Policy RES10 of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 (2022) and Policy LC1 of the Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2031 (2018) (ANDP) which require development to reflect or complement the design of the existing dwelling and respect the character and appearance of surrounding development. Policy H1 of the ANDP referred to in the Council's reason for refusal deals with new housing and is not relevant to the proposal.

Living conditions

7. The reason for refusing the application did not specify how the proposed development would impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers of No 11. However, according to the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting at which the application was considered, it was brought for their determination because Alderton Parish Council objected to the proposal on the grounds of its overbearing impact upon neighbours, in addition to parking and design concerns. Also, during the Planning Committee meeting a member commented that the original application for the house restricted how far the windows on the first floor could extend out, to maintain the privacy of neighbouring properties. I therefore consider outlook and privacy to be the main concerns regarding the effect of the proposed development upon living conditions.
8. The appeal property's rear building line extends further into the garden than that of its neighbour No 11. Consequently, its side wall is visible from the rear windows and garden of No 11. Also, No 11 has windows on its ground floor side elevation that face directly on to the side wall of the appeal property. From these windows the appeal property will already obscure views and thus have an overbearing effect to some degree. The proposed rear extension would add mass to the side elevation but not to the extent that it would significantly further reduce views from No 11's side and rear windows or garden, or appear more overbearing, particularly given the gap between the 2 houses.
9. Rear windows on the first floor of the appeal property already enable some overlooking into neighbouring gardens. The proposed development would not significantly increase overlooking into gardens either side of the appeal site, and the distance to the garden and house at 14 Ellenor Drive which backs on to the appeal site is enough to ensure there would be no loss of privacy to its occupants. Representations also raised concern regarding overshadowing. The orientation of the house and neighbouring properties is such that their rear windows and gardens receive sunlight for much of the day and the extent to which that would be reduced by the proposed development would be minimal. Overall, I conclude on this main issue that the proposed development would not

harm the living conditions of occupiers of No 11 and would not therefore conflict with Policy RES10 of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 (2022) which requires that development should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Other matters

10. The appellant has referred to their permitted development rights as a potential fall-back position in relation to the proposed dormer. I have no details of an alternative scheme demonstrating that it would be similar to, or more harmful than, the current proposal, or evidence that it would be developed in the event of this appeal being dismissed. As such, it is a matter of negligible weight.
11. Representations raised other concerns regarding parking and the impact of the proposal on property values. However, these do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR