



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2022

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/D/22/3297718

27 Cleeve View Road Cheltenham GL52 5NJ

- 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 Mrs Marianne Bainvel against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00262/FUL, dated 2 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor side extension, change of roof from hip to gable and extend loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development, the subject of the appeal, consists of a number of different elements. The Council has raised no concern with regard to the proposed side extension protruding beyond the side of the existing two storey rear wing. I agree with this assessment and I am content to deal only with the change of roof from hip to gable and the extension of the loft conversion.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, No 27 Cleeve View Road, (No 27) is one of a series of semi detached properties within a suburban street, where the prevailing character is that of two storey houses with hipped roofs. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Alterations and Extensions (February 2008) (SPD) provides that extensions should not dominate or detract from the original building, but play a supporting role. In addition, it recommends that loft conversions should not have the appearance of an extra storey on top of the house and that the dormer window should always be set within its roof. It also provides that a dormer design should reflect the character of the original building.

5. The proposed alterations to the roof and particularly the rear dormer and raising of the side and rear walls to enable the conversion would significantly increase the mass of the dwelling. It would appear bulky and disproportionate. The length and design of the roof dormer would result in the near loss of the rear roof slope and would have the appearance of a three storey flat roof house when viewed from the rear of neighbouring gardens. Notwithstanding that these rear gardens are substantial in length, the bulk of the roof conversion would be overly dominant and obtrusive when seen amongst the roofscapes in the area. As such the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 27 and the area.
6. My attention has been drawn to other extensions within the area, including those at the neighbouring properties at Nos 25 and 29 Cleeve Road. These both have extensions which include alterations to their roofs, and in the case of No 29 a rear dormer and first floor level extensions. Whilst I observed these properties on my site visit, I am not aware of the full circumstances surrounding these developments. These extensions have altered the roof form and appearance of these properties, however in the case of No 25 notwithstanding the installation of the dormer, part of the original hipped roof remains visible. Whilst No 29 has been significantly altered, the dormer is within the roof slope, nor does it result in the appearance of a third storey. As such these developments do not represent direct parallels with the appeal proposal. In any event the existence of these developments and those within the wider area do not justify development which would otherwise be harmful.
7. Therefore I conclude that the development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 27 and the area. As such the development is contrary to Policy D1 of the Cheltenham Plan (2020), and Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017). Together these policies require extensions to avoid harm to the architectural integrity of a building and to respond positively to the character of the site and its surroundings. It would also not be in accordance with guidance within the Council's SPD in respect of extensions and dormers, details of which I have outlined above. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

8. The Council has not objected to the proposed side extension protruding beyond the side of the existing two storey rear wing but as this element is not physically or functionally severable a split decision is not appropriate in respect of this particular element of the proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR