



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2025

by **J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/25/3368404

8 Taylors Ground, Quedgeley, Gloucester GL2 4JW

- 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 Nile and Mrs Lisa Campbell against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00097/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “modifications to the existing side extension of this end-terrace dwelling and the addition of a loft dormer at the rear to accommodate a fourth bedroom.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:-
 - The effect of the extensions upon the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and
 - The effect upon nearby trees.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. 8 Taylors Ground (No 8) is an end of terrace house positioned within a residential estate comprising mostly two storey houses of similar ages and styles. The house is constructed of brick under a tiled roof and has front, rear, and side extensions. To the north of the site is an area of trees, throughout which are formal and informal footpaths.
4. One of the proposed extensions would be above the existing front and side extension, having a ridge height that would extend that of the host building. To the rear, a full width flat roofed dormer would be erected, and the roof of this dormer would be of a similar height to the ridge of the host. Given the large size, mass, and tall height of the extensions, the resultant building would have an incongruously prominent appearance within the area.
5. The houses in the terrace have a repeated style, size and form, and the existing side extension to No 8 has a legible subservience to the host dwelling and to the terrace as a whole. Even with the use of matching materials, the totality of the extensions would be a dominating addition to the host building, and would harshly disrupt the rhythmical, harmonious appearance of the terrace.

6. Although the extensions would not necessitate an increase in No 8's footprint, their totality would overwhelm the modest proportions of the original dwelling. Unlike the existing side and front extension, the two storey one would extend the existing ridge height as well as project forward of the terrace's front elevation. Despite the removal of the front dormer, the projection beyond the front of the house would not appear as subservient to the host dwelling but would draw the eye, and particularly so given the simple form of the terrace as a whole.
7. To the rear, the dormer would occupy most of the roof plane, resulting in the house appearing as a three storey home. Whether detached, semi-detached or terraced, most of the surrounding houses are two storey with pitched roofs, and they have a visual cohesion whereby no house appears distinctly different. Furthermore, none of the houses surrounding the appeal property have rear dormers. The combination of two storey extensions and the large rear dormer would erode this cohesion, and the extended dwelling would stridently conflict with the character and appearance of the area.
8. The bulky totality of the extensions would also make the dwelling appear cramped within its plot, contrary to the guidance in the Council's Home Extension Guide (2008). The conspicuously imposing impact of the resultant dwelling would be visible from long distances away. The two storey projection of the front extension would appear intrusively prominent compared to the modest dimensions and simple forms of the other houses within Taylors Ground and would be apparent from various public viewpoints. From the nearby woodlands and the public footpaths within the area the extensive bulk of the side extension and rear dormer would also be clearly visible, and particularly so given the end of terrace position of the house.
9. The appellants have provided comparisons with other dwellings in the estate, including within Taylors Ground, Littlefield, Oatfield, Vensfield Road, and Weavers Road that are considered to demonstrate that the extensions align with the existing and emerging patterns of development in the area. There are a variety of house styles within the estate, and several homes have gable detailing. However, throughout the estate the presence of two storey houses gives a distinct visual cohesion to the area, and many of the comparisons cited are detached houses with a considered form having gables that are an integral part of their design. Furthermore, within Taylors Ground neither the terrace of which the appeal property forms part nor that opposite contains any houses with projecting two storey front elements. Given this and the simple style and plain forms of these terraced houses, in such a context the front gable extension would appear disruptively alien and harmfully intrusive.
10. As regards the rear dormer present upon 10 Littlefield, this house appears to be the only dwelling with such an extension in the area, and its dormer is much smaller than that proposed. It is also set down from the ridge rather than being contiguous with it and is within the roof plane, thereby having a legible subservience to the host building. Having regard to these differences it does not form a precedent for allowing the appeal.
11. For these reasons the extensions would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. The suggested conditions would not overcome these fundamental harms, and there would be conflict with Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core

Strategy (2017) (CS) and Policy A9 of the Gloucester City Plan (2023) (CP) as these require, amongst other things, that development responds positively to and respects the character of the site and its surroundings and enhances local distinctiveness, and that the extension should be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling and its wider setting, as well as not resulting in a cramped or overdeveloped site.

Protected Trees

12. The contribution trees make is recognised within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), whereby trees are valued for making an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, with existing trees being retained wherever possible. Within the public open space to the north of the appeal property are numerous tall trees, many of which are deciduous species. These trees form a distinct group within the area, and because of their height and size they are visible from long distances away, forming a leafy skyline and backdrop to the houses. The trees give a verdant maturity to the estate, as well as providing a green link along the watercourse to the river. They create a focal point within the estate, and the positive contribution they make to the area has been recognised by their inclusion within the Tree Preservation Order No 197, 2003, land adjacent to Taylors Ground, Quedgeley (TPO). Furthermore, as this is a woodland TPO the trees merit protection as a collective unit, and consequently, those trees near the appeal site are protected.
13. There are tall trees near to No 8, including two large oaks. Together the trees form a composite crown and some extend into the appeal property, including over the roof of the existing side extension, albeit they do not touch the building. There is one dead specimen near to the property boundary, and some of the oaks retain deadwood, which is a trait of this species. Most of the trees near to the boundary of No 8 have evidence of historic pruning, with one having more recent works apparent. Despite the historic pruning wounds, some of which are of a large diameter, the trees appear in good vitality and health.
14. Although the scheme has been specifically designed to minimise vertical impact, increasing the height of the side extension and the provision of the dormer would necessitate extensive pruning of the tree that currently overhangs the extension. Scaffolding is anticipated to be contained within No 8's boundary, although whether it could be erected without encroaching beyond the property has not been demonstrated. Irrespective of this, the spread of nearby crowns over the boundary line would necessitate pruning works to ensure clearance.
15. The appellants would remediate any soil impaction if it should occur. However, soil impaction can have a significant impact on the health and vitality of trees, and it is best avoided rather than remediated. In the absence of root protection measures, any details of where protective fencing, storage and compound areas would be, and the position of the scaffolding, it cannot be assumed that the trees would be unharmed by the development. In the light of these unresolved matters conditions could not be relied upon to protect the trees, particularly as in addition to construction works occurring within root areas, pruning would be required, some of which would create large diameter wounds. The combined impact of development consequences upon nearby trees would not only have a harmful impact upon their appearance, but would also impact upon their ongoing health and vitality, all of which would detract from the contribution they make to the area.

16. The Council has also referred to the likelihood of increased pressure for further works to the trees if the extensions were constructed. The trees are to the north of the property and despite their size, they would not significantly impact upon the light levels and overshadowing experienced by occupiers of the extensions. The dormer would have a large flat roof, and the nearby trees are deciduous species, many being oaks, and they would deposit leaf and seed litter. Removing these deposits would require regular and ongoing clearance. The existing occupiers of the property may be prepared to undertake the ongoing expense and inconveniences of such maintenance commitments, but it does not follow that others would, thereby resulting in pressure to undertake further works to the trees.
17. For these reasons the scheme would have an unacceptable impact upon nearby protected trees, and conditions would not resolve these fundamental harms. These harms would conflict with the requirements of CS Policy INF3 and CP Policy E7, as these seek, amongst other things, that proposals that would have an impact on trees need to include a justification for why this impact cannot be avoided, that it should be ensured there are no significant adverse impacts on existing trees and woodlands, and that where existing trees are to be retained, it is demonstrated how they will be protected through all phases of development.

Other Matters

18. Local residents have raised concerns regarding the impact of the extensions upon the living conditions of those nearby, including a loss of privacy and creating an overbearing outlook. However, following the findings above, there is no need to consider this matter further.
19. The concerns of the appellants about the management of the trees and occurrences of anti-social behaviour, would be matters for the relevant parties to pursue and have no bearing upon the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons the scheme would result in significant harms that could not be overcome by conditions, and there would be conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the requirements of the Framework, that outweigh this finding. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR