
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/W/25/3366742

31 Richmond Gardens, Gloucester, Gloucestershire GL2 0DT

- 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 Stuart Durrans against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00836/FUL.
 - The development proposed is side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A submitted drawing numbered 124-21-04 revision B was not with the Council when it determined the planning application leading to this appeal. However, the amendments shown on the plan do not fundamentally change the proposal and no injustice would be caused by having regard to the revisions in my assessment.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the host property and the local area, and (ii) living conditions at the neighbouring property 29 Richmond Gardens (No 29).

Reasons

Character and appearance.

4. The appeal property (No 31) sits at the end of a straight part of Richmond Gardens just before a bend in the highway. The properties on the straight stretch of the road are predominantly pairs of semi-detached houses. Almost all of the dwellings have side hipped roofs so that the pairs of properties generally appear balanced. This consistency leads to a pleasing rhythm to the street scene.
5. No 31 is unusual as it is a detached property. Also, it includes a tall and narrow window on one side of the front elevation whereas on the other side it contains bay windows of a more typical size and shape. However, the form of the house when seen from the front maintains a degree of symmetry, particularly as it has hipped roofs on each side. Therefore, the property displays a degree of harmony with the pattern and form of other dwellings on the straight part of Richmond Gardens.
6. The side extension would be clearly seen from the street. The proposed pitched roof would have the same ridge and eaves heights as the existing but it would have a side gable wall rather than a hipped roof. Also, the front windows in the

proposed extension would be narrower than the existing bay windows and they would be positioned further away from the entrance door. Consequently, the addition would spoil the balance and symmetry of the dwelling and it would lead to a lop-sided appearance to the front of No 31.

7. An extension has been added to a dwelling on the opposite side of the road with a side gable wall, similar to that now proposed for No 31. Also, there is a flat-roofed 2 storey extension to a nearby property. However, these additions appear unusual and they demonstrate the adverse effects of imbalanced roof forms on the pattern of development along the street. These other examples show how the appeal development would fail to integrate appropriately with the street scene and they do not set desirable precedents that should be followed for other house extensions.
8. Nearby houses on and around the bend next to the appeal property include short runs of terraces with side gable walls. However, the proposed development would be more readily visible alongside the predominantly hipped-roof dwellings on the straight part of Richmond Gardens. Amongst these houses, the proposed extension would appear incongruous so as to detract from the street scene.
9. It would be reasonable to impose a planning condition on any permission that specifies the external materials to be used in the construction of the proposed extension. As such, I am satisfied the rear dormer would appear in keeping with the existing roof. However, acceptability in these regards does not address the detriment that would be caused by the proposal's discordant aspects.
10. Therefore, I conclude the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property as well as the local area. In these respects, it would not accord with policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2017 (JCS) and policy A9 of the Gloucester City Plan 2023 (GCP). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure development respects the character of a site and its surroundings.

Effect on living conditions at No 29.

11. The extension would bring the appeal property nearer to the boundary with No 29. The Council is concerned that a window at first floor level in the side elevation of the extension would lead to overlooking onto the neighbouring property. However, the revised plan submitted with the appeal shows this window omitted from the extension and so the development would not lead to any harmful loss of privacy.
12. The extension would be clearly seen from No 29 and lead to additional overshadowing due to its height and proximity to the common boundary. However, the proposal would avoid unacceptable effects on outlook and access to light as the main impact would be to No 29's side drive and flank wall rather than to any main windows or the garden area.
13. As such, I conclude the development would have an acceptable effect on living conditions at No 29. In these regards, it would accord with JCS policy SD4 and GCP policy A9 and the requirement for development to not unduly harm living conditions at neighbouring properties.

Other Matter

14. I understand the proposed extension would accommodate the appellant's family so there would be no need to move home. However, I am unconvinced that the

proposal represents the only way the property could be extended to address the need for additional accommodation as the plot is quite large. Therefore, the benefits of the development in these regards do not overcome or override the harm I have identified in respect of the first main issue.

Conclusion

15. The proposal would avoid unacceptable harm to living conditions at the neighbouring property. However, it would have a detrimental effect on the appearance and visual qualities of the property and the street. The policy conflict I have identified in respect of the first main issue means the proposal would not accord with the development plan when read as a whole. There is no justification to grant planning permission contrary to the policies of the JCS and GCP. As such, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR