



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/G1630/D/24/3357864

382 Longford Lane, Longford, Gloucestershire, GL2 9BX

- 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 Oliver Counsell against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00800/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and front porch.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/G1630/D/24/3357868

382 Longford Lane, Longford, Gloucestershire, GL2 9BX

- 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 Oliver Counsell against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00776/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/G1630/D/24/3357864

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/G1630/D/24/3357868

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The description of the proposed development provided in the respective application forms is identical in each case. However, the schemes are of differing designs. Nevertheless, the main issues are common to both proposals and are the effect of the proposals on: (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and (b) on the living conditions of the residents of 384 Longford Lane with particular reference to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The host property is a detached dwelling of a distinctive design. In section, its front elevation resembles an A frame, with low eaves and a pronounced gable topped by a high ridge atop a steeply angled roof. From the side the roof is featureless, whilst there are minor ground floor protrusions at the rear.

5. The house stands prominently at a junction, alongside Sherwood Green and fronting Longford Lane. The former is a cul-de-sac, predominantly comprised of bungalows, although dotted with dwellings of a similar appearance to the appeal property. The dwelling shares more of a design affinity with the dwellings in Sherwood Green than Longford Lane.
6. The appeal property gains its main entrance from the cul-de-sac and its fenced rear garden runs along a substantial length of Sherwood Green, which is laid out in open plan fashion contributing to a pleasant sense of spaciousness. The appeal property's garden plays a part, above the fence, in contributing to the sense of openness felt at the entrance to the cul-de-sac, and beyond.
7. Both design proposals would transform the appearance of the host property. That is not surprising given that the extensions would both cater for 3 bedrooms at first floor level and a substantial amount of additional floorspace below. Both extensions in terms of their scale and mass appear on plan to approximately double the amount of useable floorspace in the dwelling. These, therefore, are not modest proposals in this context.
8. In other spatial circumstances, the extensions proposed may have proved acceptable in terms of their appearance. However, both proposals share something in common since both would involve two-storey protrusions projecting well beyond the plane of the host property's eastern elevation towards the back of the cul-de-sac's footway, and close to it. I consider both schemes to be unacceptable for this reason alone, since the large high, gabled extensions created would impinge on the sense of pleasant openness experienced at this point and create a harmful and over-dominant visual pinch point at the entrance to Sherwood Green.
9. I acknowledge that the sense of spaciousness experienced here has been affected to an extent by the development on the opposite side of Sherwood Green from the appeal site. However, that development is single storey, and its presence should not in my view justify a further and more harmful intrusion, as would be the case with the two extensions proposed.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions in both cases by reason of their siting, size and scale would harm the character and appearance of the site's surroundings. Accordingly, a conflict arises with those provisions of policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and policy RES10 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan (TLP) requiring new development, including extensions to existing dwellings, to respond positively to and respect the character of the site and its surroundings and that the scale of proposals is appropriate to the character and appearance of its surrounding area.

Living conditions

11. No 384 Longford Lane, a detached property, stands alongside the appeal property with but a small gap separating them. No 284 has a conservatory to the rear and a much smaller garden than the appeal property. Both schemes would involve the erection of two storey extensions protruding well beyond the neighbouring conservatory's glazed rear elevation, and close to the boundary separating the respective curtilages of the two dwellings. To my mind, the extensions would

appear intrusive and over dominant when viewed at close quarters not only from the neighbouring conservatory, but also from No 284's comparatively small garden.

12. I conclude that the proposed extensions in both cases would harm neighbouring living conditions by reason of adverse visual impact thus leading to conflict with those provisions of TLP policy RES10 which require proposals not to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Other matters

13. I have been referred to the planning history of the site, including two appeal decisions affecting the property¹. These play little part in my considerations since they relate to different forms of development.
14. Reference has been made to several development plan policies, but those to which I have referred are considered the most relevant in the circumstances of these appeals. I have also considered the various references to the *National Planning Policy Framework*. Having regard to my conclusions on both issues I regard both proposals as representing clear examples of poor design taking little or no account of the site's surroundings. I have therefore followed the Framework's guidance set out at paragraph 139.
15. The Council has drawn my attention to the presence of a listed building (*Grade II*) in Tewkesbury Road. I share the Council's view that neither of the appeal schemes would ham its setting.
16. I note the appellant's account of the planning benefits accruing from the scheme, which are reasonably realistic. However, they do not outweigh those factors which led to my conclusions on the main issues.
17. All other matters raised in the representations have been considered, including the fact that the Parish Council raised no objection. However, no other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led to my conclusions.
18. Accordingly, both appeals are dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/G1630/W/17/3185012 and APP/G1630/W/19/3230590