



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by Helen Davies MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/21/3284154

78 Perrinsfield, Lechlade GL7 3SD

- 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 Cobbing against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02418/FUL, dated 16 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is Dormer loft conversion to previously converted loft.
-

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 host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a modern housing estate which has been designed with a traditional appearance. Dwellings are a variety of sizes but the area is characterised by a high level of consistency in terms of materials and detailing. This results in a pleasant and cohesive environment. Dwellings are predominantly finished in stone, with steeply pitched tile roofs. Many of the dwellings feature a full height gable elevation fronting the street, as well as small gable dormer windows in the front and rear roof slope, which add interest and distinctiveness to the character of the area.
4. The host dwelling is detached and is fairly typical of the scale and design of other detached dwellings on the estate. It currently has two modest sized gable dormers to the rear, which are similar to gable dormers elsewhere in the area. The proposal would replace these gable dormers with a large box dormer with rendered walls. This dormer would occupy nearly all of the rear roof slope. The excessively bulky scale, flat roof design and use of render would result in the dormer being an unduly dominant feature. It would be out of keeping with and detrimental to the appearance of the existing dwelling.
5. The proposal would not be visible from the front but would be visible from the dead end road to the north of the site, as well as being easily visible from a number of neighbouring dwellings and their gardens. Whilst trees would provide some screening as certain times of year, the dormer would also be visible from a footpath in the woods directly to the rear of the site. As a result,

the dominant and discordant dormer would unduly also disrupt the consistent character and distinctive appearance of the locality.

6. The appellants have drawn my attention to an example of an existing rear box dormer at a nearby property. This dormer is not comparable in size so I cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal before me. The appellants have also made reference to a rear box dormer at 80 Perrinsfield which they say was part of a development approved by Cotswold District Council under application reference 18/02614/FUL. I viewed this dormer on site and noted some differences to the proposed dormer. Notwithstanding this, I have not been provided with details for these examples, so I have no evidence before me to indicate that either of these dormers benefit from the granting of planning permission.
7. I conclude that the proposed dormer would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the development would not comply with Policy EN2 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031, which seeks to ensure that development respects the character and distinctive appearance of the locality.

Other Matters

8. I note that the appellants would like to have had the opportunity to discuss matters with the Council prior to a decision being made. I also note that the site does not have any particular designation and no neighbour objections were received. These matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Davies

INSPECTOR