
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **R J Redford MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/24/3349189

79 Lilliesfield Avenue, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL3 3AH

- 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 McKenna against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00374/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the loft conversion. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 79 Lilliesfield Avenue, Gloucester GL3 3AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00374/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they are relevant to the single storey rear extension, and all elements regarding the loft conversion are disregarded: 292-0616/S01 Revision A; 292-0616/P04 Revision A and 292-0616/P03 Revision A
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall visually match those used in the host dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. For the following reasons, I find the single storey rear extension acceptable, and this is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the loft conversion. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the single storey rear extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached 2 storey dwelling with a single storey rear extension. It is located within an established suburban, residential area where the properties are of a similar functional vernacular. The properties are generally laid out as semi-detached pairs with symmetrical hipped roofs, although there are also

examples of symmetrical dual pitched roofs with gable ends. The majority of properties are set back behind modest front gardens and driveways which are largely open in nature and there are multiple examples of single storey extensions, mainly to the rear.

5. The proposal seeks to create additional bedrooms in the loft space by constructing a gable end and rear facing dormer with front facing rooflight and replace the existing rear extension.
6. Although there are examples of gable ends in the area, this proposal would only construct one so create an unbalanced roof form across the semi-detached pair., This would sit awkwardly within the row of uniform hipped roofed semi-detached pairs it is part of. Due to the orientation of the neighbouring buildings and open frontages, this element of the proposal would be clearly visible both from the front and side, as well as glimpsed from the rear between the properties behind. Accordingly, the incongruity of the unbalanced roof form would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
7. When considering the dormer, though the box form is not unusual in established residential areas, that proposed would be full height and nearly full width. Proportionally this would be large in relation to the host dwelling. The oversized nature in relation to the semi-detached pair is further emphasised by the need for the proposed gable extension to construct it.
8. Therefore, when considering the proposed loft conversion as a whole it would create an overbearing roof form for an otherwise modest building. It would appear clumsy and create an awkward relationship not only with the host dwelling's semi-detached neighbour, but the pairs properties surrounding it.
9. Consequently, the proposed loft conversion would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as the area. It would not constitute a well-designed extension of a residential property so fail to comply with Policy SD4 of the adopted Gloucester, Cheltenham, and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (JCS), and Policy A9 of the Gloucester City Plan (CP), as far as they seek to ensure high quality design which respects its surroundings. Nor does it follow the guidance within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Home Extensions Guide (SPD).
10. The examples of similar box dormers submitted by the appellant¹ are noted. With only limited information about the examples presented they simply serve to illustrate that each case should be determined on their own merits. During the site visit it was noted that a similar loft conversion had taken place at 37 Lilliesfield Avenue. However, this only emphasised the incongruity of non-matching roof forms over a semi-detached pair and the overbearing nature the proposed loft conversion would have.
11. Although unable to access the rear garden of the appeal site during the site visit, from the plans the proposed single storey rear extension would have a similar footprint to the existing, and the proposed lantern light roof would have a lower profile. Therefore, it would have a similar effect as the existing extension on the host dwelling. It would not be visible from the surrounding area and due to the lower height would not be as imposing as the existing when viewed from adjacent

¹ Appendix C of the Statement of Case

properties. Accordingly, it would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area so would comply with JSC Policy SD4, CP Policy A9, and the guidance in the SPD.

Other Matters

12. No harm has been identified in relation to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. However, a lack of harm, by definition cannot weigh for or against the proposal.
13. The planning application associated to this appeal was submitted post 2 April 2024 therefore the Biodiversity Net Gain Regulations must be applied. However, as householder development², this scheme would be exempt.

Conditions

14. In addition to securing commencement within the relevant statutory timeframe, I have imposed conditions requiring adherence to the approved plans but only in relation to the part of the proposed development considered acceptable. I have also added a condition to ensure the materials for the rear extension match the host dwelling to ensure a cohesive finish.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having considered the development plan along with all other relevant material considerations including the approach in the Framework, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and dismissed insofar as it relates to the loft conversion.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR

² as defined under Article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)