
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2023

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/23/3317506
29 Cedar Way, Pucklechurch BS16 9RN

- 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 Paul Parker against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P22/06368/HH, dated 7 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a side dormer to facilitate a loft conversion (retrospective). Replacement of existing single storey flat roof with a pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application sought consent for the replacement of a single storey flat roof with a pitched roof, as well as the installation of a dormer extension. The Council's Officer Report confirms the pitched roof to be acceptable, as it would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
3. The Council's Officer Report also confirms that planning consent for a very similar dormer roof extension to the appeal proposal was granted in 2021. The appeal proposal differs from the approved dormer only in terms of the external wall materials. The Council therefore accepts the principle of the size and form of the dormer extension and the reason for refusal relates only to its external wall materials.
4. Given that the proposed pitched roof extension and the size and form of the dormer extension are not points of contention between the parties, and I have no reason to disagree, these matters have not been determinative.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the side dormer roof extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, in terms of the grey PVC horizontal cladding finish.

Reasons

6. The host dwelling is a semi-detached chalet style property, which includes green hanging tiles at first floor level and bricks at ground floor. The large side dormer extension introduces a further external material to the dwelling, as it has been finished in PVC grey horizontal cladding.
7. The PVC cladding differs in colour to the existing hanging tiles, and it also has a glossier finish than the matte tiles and bricks. Consequently, the dormer roof extension fails to integrate with the host dwelling. This difference in colour and texture makes an already large structure appear significantly more noticeable. The structure is therefore at odds with, and unduly harms, the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.
8. The dwelling occupies a prominent position in a group of homes which front onto an attractive area of public open space. Whilst there are other rows of houses within the vicinity which include a variety of materials, the palette of original materials remains mostly intact within the line of dwellings within which the appeal property sits. One house has a small cladding finish dormer but given its limited size, it is significantly less visible within the streetscene than the appeal dormer. As such, the appeal dormer is an incongruous feature which unacceptably undermines the largely uniform character and appearance of this row of properties.
9. On my site visit, I observed within the vicinity examples of dormer roof extensions which are of a similar size to the appeal structure. However, these are generally finished with hanging tiles to match the dwellings on which they are located. Therefore, those dormers sit comfortably within the context of the host properties, rather than appearing as unsympathetic additions which dominate the host dwellings, as is the case with the appeal scheme.
10. I have also considered examples of other dwellings in the wider area submitted by the appellant in support of the appeal. I accept that the timber clad dormers at Holly Close do not reflect the hanging tiles on the original elements of those properties. Whereas the colours of the dormer extensions referred to on Hawkrigde Drive reflect the hanging tiles on the host dwellings.
11. I recognise that many two-storey terraced and semi-detached properties in the area include panels of PVC cladding. However, it is installed on original parts of those houses and therefore sits comfortably in the context of the host dwellings. Whereas the cladding which is the subject of this appeal is located on a bulky roof extension and is therefore substantially more prominent than that included on these other properties.
12. Based on the limited information before me and what I was able to observe on site, it appears that the circumstance of the schemes referred to by the appellant differ from the appeal proposal. That aside, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. As such, none of these outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
13. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy 2006-2027 (2013), Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies Sites and Places Plan (2017) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together, these

seek to secure good quality design which respects the character and appearance of an existing dwelling and the wider area.

Other matters

14. I note that the appellant considers PVC to be a more sustainable product than hanging tiles and that he believes it needs less maintenance. Also, I recognise that hanging tiles are currently difficult to source. However, as I have described, the PVC grey cladding differs in both finish and colour from the original hanging tiles and therefore gives rise to a discordant feature. Therefore, neither of these matters, considered on their own or cumulatively, outweigh the significant harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR