

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by S Indermaur BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

### Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

---

#### Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/25/3360130

#### 37 Laburnum Road, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL1 5PG

- 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 Nevaro Codlin against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/00844/FUL.
  - The development proposed is described as a first-floor extension to property.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

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. The main issue for which is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal building is one half of a pair of two storey semi detached dwellings in a residential area. It shares a lean to forward projecting single storey extension with its adjoined neighbour. Other pairs have been extended in similar ways and whilst there is some variety in roof form and size thereto, alterations have been limited to the ground floors as they face the street which, along with the local form, scale and materials palette, garners a strong sense of consistency to the street scene and general symmetry between each pair which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area
4. The proposed forward facing gable would be positioned higher than the eaves of the existing property. It's lack of subservience in this respect would be exacerbated by it being a largely anomalous first floor front projection in the street. It would have a highly noticeable unbalancing effect on the pair of buildings, unacceptably reducing the quality of the area's sense of symmetry and consistency.
5. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. In conflict with Policy A9 of the Gloucester City Plan (2023) and Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017). Together, and amongst other matters, these set out that design should be in keeping with, respond positively to and respect the character and form of the original building and its surroundings. The appeal scheme would also conflict with the Gloucester City Council Home Extension Guide (2008) which suggests, amongst other things, that

extensions should be of a style, form and design that is appropriate and respectful to the character of the locality and the appearance of the existing house.

### **Other Matter**

6. There would be benefits of having extra space in the property to accommodate for a family. However, these would be private and there is no compelling evidence to suggest the appeal scheme is the only means of achieving them. I would therefore only ascribe the matter limited weight.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

7. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and, having taken them into account, there are no material considerations that justify granting permission in light thereof. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

*S Indermaur*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

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

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR