



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2023

**By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**  
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 19<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/D/22/3307141**

**3 Apple Close Prestbury CHELTENHAM GL52 3EJ**

- 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 and Mrs Warner against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
  - The application Ref: 22/01145/FUL dated 23 June 2022 was refused by notice dated 9 August 2022.
  - The development proposed is single storey extension, loft conversion including raising the height of the roof.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey extension, loft conversion including raising the height of the roof at 3 Apple Close Prestbury CHELTENHAM GL52 3EJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 22/01145/FUL dated 23 June 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A914P-459-02 RevC and A914P-459-03 RevC.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials which match those used in the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and neighbouring development.

### Reasons

3. Number 3 Apple Close (No.3) is a link-detached two-storey dwelling located within a short cul-de-sac of broadly similar houses but differently arranged with respect to the road as to set back and floor levels. Apple Close is found within a typical late-twentieth-century residential area with undulating topography and differing house designs providing some variety of layout and appearance.
4. The appellant proposes to replace an existing conservatory extension with a flat-roofed extension and to convert the roof space into living accommodation. Although the Council have expressed an absence of concern as to the ground floor alterations or of any impact on neighbouring users, the existing roof form

is of insufficient height for habitable spaces, requiring the roof ridge to be raised such that a rear dormer can be inserted.

5. The accommodation to be created would sit almost completely within the full-width dormer which would replace the rear slope of the main roof, the result would be a modest increase in pitch of the front roof slope to attain an increase at the ridge which, according to the appellant, would be slightly less than the 500mm quoted by the Council.
6. The ridge level of No.3 would be higher than that of its neighbour, 2 Apple Close, which is similarly positioned in the street, however, there is no wide consistency in terms of the setting of other houses in the area as to heights and relationship with the street. Overall, noting the variety of roof form in the wider area, what is proposed would introduce change in building form and the appearance of the property but this would be at the rear (which is not generally apparent) and consequently the degree of change would not be so great as to be obtrusive. In that regard it would be important to ensure alterations employ materials which are a good match to those found in the existing building.
7. Even if the change in appearance (and the introduction of an additional floor of accommodation in an area dominated by two-storey housing) were considered to bring about a degree of harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area, I consider the harm would be limited and outweighed, in this instance, by the benefit of providing additional accommodation. On that basis there would be no conflict with Policy D1 of the Cheltenham Plan 2020 or Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 which seek to avoid harm to architectural integrity of buildings by good design, or, in consequence, with the development plan taken as a whole.
8. Therefore, having considered all matters raised and for the reasons given the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing conditions, and, for the reasons given, a condition to control materials.

*Andrew Boughton*

INSPECTOR