



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 5 September 2011

by Jennifer Armstrong JP BA FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 September 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/E/11/2147971

Vine Cottage, 101 Hucclecote Road, Gloucester, GL3 3TR

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Meulbrouck against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application ref. 10/00765/LBC, dated 13 July 2010, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2010.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/A/11/2148573

Vine Cottage, 101 Hucclecote Road, Gloucester, GL3 3TR

- 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 R Meulbrouck against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application ref. 10/00758/FUL, dated 13 July 2010, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2010.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Reasons

3. No. 101 is half of a Grade II listed building – a seventeenth century timber-framed house which was subdivided in the nineteenth century. Its unusually high and striking timber-framed and plastered façade makes an interesting and significant contribution to the street scene, all the more so because it is one of the few old buildings along this busy suburban road. In assessing the proposal I have had regard to the government's Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS 5 - Planning for the Historic Environment) which sets out a presumption in favour of the conservation of listed buildings, seeking new development to make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.
4. The side and rear elevations of the original building have been considerably altered and added to over the years. In 2002 consent was granted to 'square off' existing extensions at no. 101. Changes to fenestration and some internal

alterations associated with that proposal have taken place but the main structural work has not been implemented, and the current applications involve a further elongation of the side extension by about 3m. This would result in a single storey addition some 7m long stretching back from the gable end chimney stack.

5. The existing addition extends well beyond the rear line of the original building and of its later two storey lean-to addition, and I find that its elongated nature already detracts somewhat from the form and layout of the listed building. Increasing its length would exacerbate this situation, resulting in development which would not make a positive contribution to the listed building itself or indeed to views of it from outside the site, bearing in mind that the extent of the roof line would be seen from Hucclecote Road, above the side boundary wall. While acknowledging the relatively small scale of the proposal I consider that it would be harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the building. In this respect, I find relevant the comment in the Practice Guide to PPS 5 that some works may seem individually to be of little importance but can cumulatively be destructive of a listed building's significance.
6. It is clear from what I have read that the appellant and his family have spent much time and money on the building and I appreciate their desire to have a new room overlooking the rear garden. I do not find, however, that these personal factors override the harmful impact identified above. Neither do the proposals have any public benefit to weigh against the harm.
7. The owner of the neighbouring property, no. 103, is concerned that the extension would block sunlight to her garden. However, as it would be both single storey in height and to the north-west of that property I do not consider that its impact would be such as to justify refusal.
8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

J. Armstrong

INSPECTOR

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer

Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk