



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/24/3347674

4 Grayling Close, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL4 5ED

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Britto against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00272/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear and front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the above description from the application form but note from the evidence that the scheme includes converting the garage to a study. I have taken this into account in my recommendation. I have also omitted the words 'a renewal of 19/00536/FUL' as this is not the development proposed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 5 Grayling Close (No 5) with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a corner plot with the rear elevation abutting the side elevation of No 5 within a wider set of 4 detached dwellings. The building line of the group is slightly irregular with the appeal unit being set forward of No 5.
6. The two-storey side extension would address the side boundary of No 5. There would be a small separation gap between the boundary of the neighbouring property and the proposal. Notwithstanding this, due to the length of the proposal, which would appear larger by virtue of the building position and the significant height, would be an oppressive façade looming over No 5. The proposal would be viewed on both ground and first floor level and would appear as a blank brick wall which would have no visual interest and block some of the open view already experienced. The garden space immediately adjacent to the property would also experience poor outlook due to its positioning and substantial height shrouding the property.

7. With this and the above in mind, the appeal scheme would lead to an unacceptably poor standard of outlook for No 5. It would therefore conflict with Policy SD14 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewksbury Joint Core Strategy 2017, Policy A9 of the Gloucester City Plan 2023, the Gloucester City Council Home Extension Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that living conditions of the occupiers of properties are protected.

Other Matters

8. A previous permission was granted in 2019 and appears to have lapsed, therefore there would be no fallback position for the appeal development. It is also important to understand that the 2019 consent was decided in the context of a previous permission to No 5. However, the evidence provided suggests that permission was in 2007 and subsequently had lapsed and not been implemented. On this basis, little weight can be given to the previous decision and the scheme before me has been considered on the evidence provided and as viewed on the site visit.
9. The lack of a VSC test being considered as part of the original application is referred to. However, no evidence has been provided to confirm what it is and what impact it would have on the assessment of this appeal. In any event, the refusal reason focusses on the effect of the proposal being overbearing rather than loss of light. The appellant has also raised concerns with the handling of the original application but, this is a procedural matter that is for them to resolve with the Council directly and not for me to form a view on here.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR