



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/24/3354525**

**2 Beaconsfield, Hawkesbury Upton, South Gloucestershire GL9 1AP**

- 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 James Crossfield against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
  - The application Ref is P24/00255/HH.
  - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side extension and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation and facilitate loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of first floor side extension and installation of rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation and facilitate loft conversion at 2 Beaconsfield, Hawkesbury Upton, South Gloucestershire GL9 1AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P24/00255/HH, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted 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 drawing nos :Site Location Plan, Proposed Floor Plans (PL101 Rev D), Existing and Proposed North and East Elevations (PL111 Rev C), Existing and Proposed South and West Elevations (PL112 Rev A).
  - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Amended plans have been submitted with the appeal. These remove the dormer from the proposal. The appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, and whilst submitted to the Council, these were not considered in full and the decision was issued on the basis of the original scheme. Given the refusal reason set out below and issues raised by the Council, this is a substantial difference and a fundamental change to the proposal. It would ultimately result in a different application and as such, I will consider the proposal on the basis of the scheme refused by the Council.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property consists of a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The immediate neighbours comprise of semi or detached dwellings, some two storey, some single storey, and with a variety of roof forms and extensions evident. Nearby, towards the centre of the settlement I observed a number of dwellings with visible dormers.
5. The proposed extension would be of a scale and siting that respects the character of the site and would sit comfortably within the surrounding mixed context. The proposed dormer, located on the rear elevation, would be of a limited scale and would have a pitched roof. The supplementary planning document 'Householder Design Guide' (2021) advises that dormers should be sited 500mm from the main ridge and eaves level. Even if the dormer would not be set down or up to this extent, there would be a clear gap to both ridge and eaves. This would ensure that the dormer would not be overbearing nor over dominant and would respect the existing character of the dwelling.
6. Given the examples of observable similar dormers nearby, the dormer would not appear discordant or out of keeping with the surrounding area.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or surrounding area. There is therefore no conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) and Policy PSP38 South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017), which require development to be high-quality in terms of design and respect the surrounding area.

## Other Matters

8. The appeal site is located outside but near to the Hawkesbury Upton Conservation Area (CA). I observed that the significance of the CA is partly derived from the number of historic buildings within the centre of the settlement, with a village green as a focal point. The setting of the CA is made up of the existing mixed surrounding built form including modern residential development, and as such, has a limited role in the significance of the CA.
9. The proposal would sit comfortably as part of its existing mixed surrounding context. As such, the proposal would not harm the setting of the CA. The development would not therefore conflict with the prevention of harm to heritage assets, including their setting, goals of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty.
11. A condition requiring the extensions to match the existing dwelling in terms of materials is necessary to ensure the development is in keeping with the existing property.

## **Conclusion**

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

*B Phillips*

INSPECTOR