



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/D/22/3299708

21 Charlton Close, Cheltenham GL53 8DH

- 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 & Mrs Eric and Jane McClements against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00181/FUL, dated 27 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension at 21 Charlton Close, Cheltenham GL53 8DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00181/FUL, dated 27 January 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings; 21CC.P01 and 21CC.P03 Rev B.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2 storey dwelling positioned at the end of a cul-de-sac. It has a projecting 2 storey element to the front and flat roof additions to either side. The area is residential in character, comprising dwellings of an eclectic mix of architectural styles and external materials, which creates a pleasant and diverse street scape. The proposed extension would replace the existing single storey projections to the side elevation of the property.
4. Although the new extension would extend beyond the front and rear wall of the property to which it would be attached, it would not project forward of the 2 storey front gable or the front porch and would thus not be a prominent or dominant addition to the dwelling. Moreover, at the rear, its single storey scale and design would ensure that it would be subordinate in scale to the host dwelling.

5. The new extension would be a markedly modern addition with its asymmetrical roof and contrasting materials. However, given the design of the host property with a mixture of roof designs and materials, it would not appear as an unduly incongruous or incompatible feature. Furthermore, as a consequence of its secluded location in the cul-de-sac, the extension would be seen primarily at an oblique angle from the public domain, with the side elevation of the extension being the most prevalent, thus reducing the visual prominence of the more contemporary aspect of the extension in the street scape.
6. Whilst the design would conflict with the Council's Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2008 (SPD) in that the shape of the roof would not reflect that of the main dwelling, there would be no conflict with the SPD's aims of maintaining the character of the house.
7. I conclude that, despite a degree of conflict with advice in the SPD in respect of the design of the extension, for the reasons set out above the extension would not be out of scale with the existing dwelling, nor would it appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling by virtue of its design. As such, the extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies D1 of the Cheltenham Plan 2020 and SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031, which seek to ensure high quality design.

Conditions

8. It is necessary to list the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I note the Council's suggested condition that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building. The submitted plans indicate that the extension would be constructed using facing brick with a slate roof, which I find acceptable for the reasons set out above. A condition requiring the materials to match the existing would therefore be neither reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Emma Worley

INSPECTOR