



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by **Andrew Fuller BSc (Hons), Dip TP, MA, RTPI, IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003238

6 Townsend Street, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL51 9HD

- 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 Jeremy Glanfield against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01756/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for the 'Erection of a first floor side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Townsend Street comprises a street of two-storey terrace properties, which follow a building line at the back of the pavement. All properties have shallow pitched roofs, albeit with small variations to the ridgeline. The appeal site is located at the head of the street at the junction with Tewkesbury Road, which comprises a modern dual carriageway forming a wide intersection with Townsend Street and Gloucester Road.
4. The appeal site is typical of the other properties in the street in both its width, height and roof form. The existing gable profile of the principal house is visible in long range views along Tewkesbury Road and across the junction. Beneath it, and forming the corner of the plot along the Tewkesbury Road elevation, is a splayed, single-storey side extension.
5. The proposal is for a first floor extension above the existing corner extension and would be topped with a flat roof. This proposed form would be unsympathetic to the host property and uncharacteristic of the street's established roof form of pitched roofs. The proposed flat roof would be read in stark contrast to the continuous ridgeline of the terrace that it would be annexed to. It would form an incongruous feature in this location, harming the character and appearance of the appeal site and street. Moreover, it would be dominant and harmful in the long views along Tewkesbury Road in both directions and particularly across the wide open junction from the approach along Gloucester Road.
6. In making my decision, I have had regard to Policy D1 of the Cheltenham Plan (2020) (the Plan). It allows for some discretion in design, sanctioning a departure

from the established appearance of a building in limited circumstances. The appellant believes this to be an appropriate instance where a different roof design might be acceptable. However, due to the modest scale of the host property and the regularity of the roof design along the street, such a departure in favour of a flat roof would be wholly incongruous.

7. Whilst the extension is sizable and with a door and windows towards Tewkesbury Road, the proposal would not be read as an independent structure, as argued by the appellant, but clearly as an extension, to the host property. I am assessing the proposed development as an extension, not as a new dwelling. Therefore, Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Alterations and Extensions (2008) (SPD), that seeks the character of a house to influence an extensions design, including the pitch and shape of the roof, is relevant in this decision. As described above, the proposed development would fail to accord with this guidance.
8. On my site visit, and as highlighted by the appellant, I saw that there are examples of flat and parapeted roofs throughout Cheltenham in both historic and contemporary development. In the surrounding area to the appeal site, these included a large block of flats, some residential streets where all the houses have parapeted and flat roofs, and main roads, such as High Street, where building height, styles and ages varied significantly along with their roof form. Whilst nearby, these areas have different architectural and townscape characteristics to that of Townsend Street and are in marked contrast with the appeal site. Ultimately, the existence of those other roof types, beyond Townsend Street, has not led me to an alternative conclusion on this main issue.
9. It has also been brought to my attention that there is a short run of buildings, including the Horse and Jockey public house, at the far end of Townsend Street which have parapet roofs. These parapets only partially screen their pitched roofs, which are still visible on the approach from Russell Street. Again, these limited examples do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on this main issue.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. As such, it conflicts with Policy D1 of the Cheltenham Plan (2020) and Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017) which require, amongst other matters, for extensions to avoid causing harm to the architectural integrity of the building or groups of buildings.

Other Matters

11. I accept that the property is not located within a conservation area. Nevertheless, this weighs neither for nor against the scheme.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and that there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Fuller

INSPECTOR