



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025 by S Indermaur

Decision by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/25/3360955

26 Little Elmbridge, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL2 0HH

- 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 Judy Clifford against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00877/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extensions and internal alterations.
-

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 and Main Issue

3. The proposal includes the erection of a front porch which the Council finds acceptable. Based on all that I have seen and read, I see no reason to take a different view. The main issue is therefore, the effect of the proposed 2-storey side and rear extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a hipped roof semi-detached dwelling with an existing single storey rear extension that connects to the attached side garage. The street vernacular is characterised by a mix of bungalows and 2-storey semi-detached properties that share a similar appearance, including hipped roofs, matching materials and balanced window to wall proportions. Some dwellings have been extended and altered but the overall character of the area remains intact. As one of the original semi-detached dwellings, the appeal site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The Gloucester City Council Home Extension Guide (HEG) 2008, advises that side extensions to semi-detached properties should normally be set back from the front of the property and set down from the ridge line, to ensure it does not adversely detract from the pair of properties. It goes on to say that the spacing, style and form of new windows should normally match those of the existing property.
6. The proposed side extension would not be set down from the existing ridge line or back from the front façade. The front elevation would be angled to project slightly forwards of the principal elevation of the host dwelling. Whilst this is the arrangement for the existing single storey side extension, the additional height

would exacerbate its unusual and unsympathetic alignment. In this way, the development would be large in scale and would not appear as subservient to the original property.

7. The significant bulk and mass would be evident from within the street scene due to the straight alignment of Little Elmbridge to the north-west, and the position of the host dwelling at the corner of the road. Angling the proposed extension to follow the site boundary rather than the side elevation of the dwelling, would not only exacerbate the bulk of the extension, but also result in a contorted roof scape where the rear hip would be visible to the side. This would result in a poor-quality appearance where the added bulk and complexity of form would dominate and detract from the uniformity of the pair of semi's, causing harm to the street scene.
8. Furthermore, the proposal would not respect the proportions or alignment of the existing windows, leaving expanses of brickwork within the front elevation that would serve to unbalance the appearance of the dwelling and its attached neighbour.
9. The appellant has made references to multiple examples of side extensions in the immediate vicinity at No 86, 84, 82 and 78 Little Elmbridge. However, all of these extensions are set down from the existing ridgeline and back from the building line, bar one example. I have not been provided with full details of the circumstances for the side extension at No 84, including whether and when planning permission may have been granted. However, this type of development appears to be an anomaly within the street scene. As such, I am not persuaded that this form of development defines a principal aspect of the character and appearance of the area to justify setting aside the harm identified.
10. I conclude that the proposed 2-storey side and rear extensions would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. In this regard, the proposal would conflict with Policy A9 of the Gloucester City Plan (2023) and Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017). Together these policies state that the design and size of development should be in keeping with and respond positively to the character and scale of the original building and its surroundings. The proposal would also conflict with the HEG as set out above.

Other Matters

11. Within appendices 2-4 of the appellant's statement, they have provided examples of extensions they consider have been recently approved with no set-back. However, I have not been presented with the full details of these examples, including their addresses and the planning policy and guidance context they were permitted under. It is not clear that the circumstances are comparable to the proposal before me such that the examples provided, do not affect my findings.
12. The lack of harm with regard to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants is a neutral matter, weighing neither for, nor against, the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons

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

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Clowes

INSPECTOR