



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/24/3354707

90 Linden Road, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL1 5HD

- 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 Evie Owens-Curtis against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00460/FUL .
 - The development proposed is described as “two-storey side extensions”.
-

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 Matter

3. A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 90 Linden Road (no 90) is a two-storey detached property positioned on a corner plot at the junction of Linden Road and Seymour Road. In contrast to the predominantly terraced and semi-detached houses in the area, no 90 stands out as a detached property, with a clear separation from its neighbouring property to the west. Its corner plot affords it a dual-aspect design, with windows overlooking both Linden Road and Seymour Road. From the street scene, the existing ground floor rear extension is mostly obscured, allowing the property to present a simple roof form and fenestration that is all of similar design and largely follows a symmetrical

layout. In addition, the property features a distinctive catslide roof, a feature characteristic of many houses to the west.

6. No concerns were raised by the Council regarding the impact of the proposed side extension facing Linden Road, which has sought to replicate the style and features of the appeal dwelling. Based on the available evidence and my own observations, I have no reasons to reach an alternative view.
7. However, the proposed two-storey rear/side extension would, by reason of its excessive bulk and massing, but also its incongruous shape, harmfully contrast with the character of the host property. Whilst it would be set down from the ridge of the property, the extension would unduly stand out as a dominant, boxy and jarring addition. It would thus fail to respect the simple character of this traditional dwelling and erode the ability to appreciate the sweeping nature of the catslide roof, particularly from Seymour Road, where the existing roofscape of the appeal property and neighbouring buildings adds interest to the street scene.
8. The identified harm would be exacerbated by the extension's lack of subservience, as it would overwhelmingly dominate the host property due to its excessive width, and protrude beyond its front elevation. It would present a bland elevation to the Linden Road street scene, and also fail to align with the property's current ridge or eaves height. As a result, it would appear as an ungainly and disjointed addition that would disrupt the existing roof profile and detract from the simple design of the host dwelling.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017), A9 and F1 of the Gloucester City Plan (2023) the Framework and the Council's Home Extension Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2008). Amongst other things, these highlight the need for well-designed developments that align with the existing dwelling's character, respect and compliment the site's surroundings, and enhance the nearby built environment whilst being sympathetic to it.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has suggested the rear dormer element of the proposal should be assessed as a two-storey extension rather as a dormer, claiming it would not harm the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of light, overshadowing, overbearing impact, loss of privacy, noise, smell, traffic, or other disturbances, and therefore complies with the development plan. However, regardless of how the proposal is classified, it does not mitigate the harm which the development would cause to the character and appearance of no 90 and the surrounding area. The absence of harm in other respects is a neutral factor that carries no weight for or against the proposal.
11. I understand the wishes of the appellants to extend their house to provide space for their growing family and allow them to stay in the property and the area. This is however outweighed by the harm that I have identified and for this reason, this consideration is ascribed very limited weight.
12. Concerns have been raised by an interested party regarding potential parking issues which may arise as a result of this development. However, the Council has

not found harm in this respect. Based on the evidence before me, and my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree with that assessment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR