



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3358129

69 St. Davids Avenue, Cadbury Heath, South Gloucestershire, BS30 8DA

- 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 Doug Stock against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/01884/HH.
 - The development proposed is Installation of rear dormer and window to facilitate loft conversion. Installation of Soil stack pipe, micro-wind turbine and solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of the development in the banner heading above from the Council's decision notice, avoiding superfluous wording, as this gives a more concise description of the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The Council has raised no objection to the micro wind turbine, soil stack and solar panel elements of the proposed development. There are no reasons to disagree. The main issues in this appeal, therefore, are the effect of the proposed rear dormer upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a 2-storey end of terraced house located behind a turning head at the end of a cul-de-sac. The rear of the house is visible from the rear of houses on St Davids Avenue and Heath Rise and in glimpses from the pavement and road between the houses on these roads.
5. The council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (SPD) advises that flat roofed box dormers are not considered good design because they visually intrude on the roofscape and harm the character and appearance of buildings. However, where there is no viable alternative, the SPD sets specific measurements that dormers should be set in from the sides of the roof, down below the roof ridge, and above the eaves, so that they do not dominate a roof.

6. The proposed development does not meet the SPD's requirements in this regard. Although part of it would be above a 2 storey side extension which is set back from the main rear building line, thus breaking up its mass to some degree, it would extend to the sides of the roof and only slightly above the eaves level. Consequently, it would fill most of the roof plane appearing as a third storey to the house rather than as a subservient addition to the roof, harming the character and appearance of the host property and appearing at odds with other houses within the terrace. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013), Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) and the SPD which only permits development of a high-quality design that enhances local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matter

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other rear dormers in the area which similarly fill the rear roof plane of their host properties. Also, the council acknowledges that 63 St David's Avenue, opposite the appeal property, and 100 St David's Avenue nearby, have large rear dormers, but note that they predated the adoption of the SPD. I saw several rear dormers in the surrounding area which were obtrusive because of their scale and dominance. They appear particularly out of character because there are a relatively few of them locally. I note that home improvements to other properties within the area have changed their external appearance to some degree, but few have the impact that the proposed development would have in terms of its size and effect on the roofscape. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR