



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2025

by **Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/25/3368049

43 Highfield Road, Gloucester, Gloucestershire, GL4 4LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Jones against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00175/FUL.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and erection of 1.8m high fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon i) the character of the site and the character and appearance of the area and ii) highway safety.

Reasons

Character of the site and the character and appearance of the area

3. The appeal site is a two storey, semi-detached, dwelling which is located on a corner plot between Concorde Way and Highfield Road. The proposal seeks planning permission for the construction of a two-storey side extension and the erection of a 1.8-metre-high fence. Based upon the first refusal reason, and the Council's reasoning within their delegated report, the first refusal reason regarding character and appearance is based upon the two-storey side extension. No refusal reasoning is given based upon the proposed boundary fencing with regard to character of the existing dwelling and its wider setting and I have no reason to conclude differently.
4. It is acknowledged that, during the application period, the two storey side extension was revised to be set back (by in the region of 0.30 metres (not in excess of a metre as stated within the appellant's statement)) and down at the ridge (by in the region of 0.27 metres), however, I find that the proposal as submitted would be insufficient to be clearly read as a subservient extension to both the host dwelling and the street scene. The proposed extension would be in the region of 5.7 metres in width compared to the existing width of the host property in the region of 7.4 metres. Overall, I find that the bulk, scale and massing would dominate the host property and would contribute to a significant imbalance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings within the street scene due to the extension's dominance.
5. The bulk, scale and massing would be exacerbated by the proposed use of a gable ended extension with timber cladding to the central panel which would fail to appropriately integrate with the host dwelling as well as being uncharacteristic in

the context of the general character and appearance of properties within the vicinity and in the immediate street scene. The proposal would result in an alien and inharmonious addition which would be inappropriate, unsympathetic and cause harm to both the character of the host dwelling itself as well as the character and appearance of the immediate area within which proposals would be viewed. The proposal would fail to respond positively to the character, scale and form of the existing dwelling and the residential properties within the immediate area. The proposal could not, therefore, be considered high quality, sustainable, development due to the adverse impact on the character of the locality and the appearance of the street scene for the reasons outlined. This would be exacerbated further due to the more sensitive location of the appeal site within a corner plot where it would be highly visible and prominent at the junction with Concorde Way and Highfield Road.

6. I note that the appellant makes reference to an application which is stated to have been approved at 64 Highfield Road (15/00279/FUL for a two-storey side extension (partly above existing utility room)). The appellant has included, within their statement of case, copies of the plans, delegated report and decision notice as annex 1. The proposal at 64 Highfield Road would have been considered, and approved, prior to the current Local Plan policies against which the proposal which is before me should be considered would have been adopted - albeit the SPD would have been a consideration for the proposals. The proposal at 64 Highfield Road is noted to have been approved with a set down of in the region of 0.3 metres, however, with that proposal there was a notable set back from the front of the property which is not the case within this appeal. Overall, notwithstanding that each case should be considered on its own merits, I do not find that the proposals referred to at 64 Highfield Road are comparable to or could be utilised to support or justify the proposals which are before me within this appeal.
7. I have acknowledged, as outlined above, some set back and set down but find that this would still be insufficient and would result in a proposal which would fail to ensure a clear visual distinction between the host dwelling and the extension. The proposal would fail to remain subordinate. The Gloucester City Council Home Extension Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2008 (SPD) advises that extensions should not swamp or dominate the existing property and that side extensions to semi-detached properties should normally be set back from the front of the property and set down from the ridgeline to ensure that it does not adversely detract from the pair of properties. The SPD does not give specific guidance as to set back or set down (specifically in terms of measurements or guidance of that nature), however, as a matter of planning judgement I find the proposal unacceptable and contrary to the guidance/objectives provided within the SPD.
8. The proposal would be inconsistent with the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2017 (JCS) Policy SD4 which requires proposals to respond positively to and respect the character of the site and its surroundings as well as a general requirement for high quality design and Gloucester City Plan 2023 Policy A9 which requires that extensions of residential properties will be permitted where the height, size, design and external facing materials of the extension are in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling and its wider setting. The proposal would also be inconsistent with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Highway safety

9. The second refusal reason is based upon concern as to unacceptable impact on highway safety due to the height and siting of the proposed fencing. The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a fence, 1.8 metres high, around the perimeter of the appeal site as annotated on the proposed block plan (drawing number BP.01). I note that the highway consultee has provided suggested conditions in the event this appeal was allowed, however, I find that requirements for conditions requesting an electric vehicle charging point to be installed and that access space is maintained to the front and rear building entrances plus side and rear space for cycle storage should, as the Council have outlined, only apply for a new dwelling and would not therefore be applicable to a proposal for an extension and associated fencing.
10. The highway consultee has advised that the fence should be maintained at current height for visibility of emerging site vehicles and the junction, otherwise reduced to in the region of 0.60 metres high and cut back where visibility is required for the additional parking space proposed. Based upon the evidence before me, and my site visit, I do not find that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The fencing would replace the existing timber fencing, albeit at a greater height, but I find that the fencing would be (and is) located with a good set back and pavement depth at the access point to the appeal site which I find would provide sufficient visibility for those accessing the appeal site as well as other users at the junction at Concorde Way and Highfield Road to avoid conflict.
11. I do not find, therefore, that the second refusal reason can be reasonably upheld and the proposal would be consistent with JCS Policy INF1 which requires safe and accessible connections to the transport network and sets out that permission will only be granted where the impact of development is not considered to be severe. The proposal would also be consistent with paragraph 116 of the Framework which confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR