

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2023

Appeal ref: APP/U1620/D/23/3327080

8 Blossom Court, Bristol Road, Quedgeley, Gloucester GL2 4BT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs George and Rachel Mason against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application, ref. 23/00245/FUL, validated 23 March 2023, was refused by a notice dated 18 May 2023.
 - The development is: Convert Existing Garage into family/play room and construct a replacement detached garage with drive access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the likely effect of the proposed single garage at No. 8 Blossom Court on the Bristol Road street scene.

Appeal property and proposal

3. No. 8 Blossom Court is a detached 2 storey dwelling in a short cul-de-sac off Bristol Road, B4008. The narrow gable frontage of No. 8 with its integral single garage is set back some 35m from Bristol Road. The land attached to No. 8, however, extends in a narrow strip alongside No. 313 Bristol Road, widening to the rear edge of the B4008 footway.
4. The use of the garage within the dwelling at No. 8 would be changed to become part of the living accommodation of the house. The garage facility would be replaced by the construction of a detached single car structure built on the grassed space close to the southern corner of the junction of Blossom Court and Bristol Road.

Considerations

5. As the Council said, the conversion of the integrated garage into a family room would produce a different appearance to the other dwellings in the Close. I agree with them, however, that the conversion works, which would include a new bay window, would cause no harm to the street scene. Indeed, it may be an improvement.

6. The pitched roof garage to be accessed from Blossom Court would be located on the unoccupied grassed land, part of the land attached to No. 8, close to the corner with Bristol Road. The new garage building would be 4.6m wide, 6.1m long. The ridge would be 4.7m high, the eaves 2.35m high.
7. Whilst the utility of the new garage would be a benefit to the house at No. 8, I consider that it would appear unduly and unacceptably prominent in the immediate Bristol Road scene. It would be an incongruously isolated structure, not obviously associated with the house at No. 8. The design of proposed building is utilitarian, its tall pitched roof with a ridge line running across its width adding to an ill-fitting look in its surroundings. The blank western elevation facing onto Bristol Road forward of No. 311 Bristol Road and well in front of housing to the south of the junction with Blossom Court would add to its inharmonious appearance.
8. As the Appellants said, there is a considerable variation in the layout and design of housing properties along this part of Bristol Road. That adds interest to the street scene. It does not suggest acceptance of what would be an intrusive and poorly designed structure almost adjoining the rear edge of the Bristol Road eastern side footway. I can understand the Appellants' wish to add to their accommodation. But it should not be at the cost of material harm to the appearance of the Bristol Road/Blossom Court junction area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal is dismissed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR