



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3360066

92 Bradley Road, Patchway, South Gloucestershire, BS34 5HS

- 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 Sutera against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02187/HH.
 - The development proposed is Loft conversion with the erection of a rear dormer, changes to roof to 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development of the rear dormer was complete. I also note that the application has been submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey semi-detached house on the corner of Bradley Road and Arlingham Way. Although there are mature trees and hedges within the front garden and along the side boundary of the appeal site, the rear of the property is visible along Arlingham Way approaching the junction with Bradley Road and is particularly prominent because of its corner location.
6. Policy PSP38 of South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (LP) states that extensions should respect the form, scale and proportions of the original building. The supporting text includes an illustrative example of the harm a box dormer can have on the appearance of a house, and the council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (SPD) further advises that flat roofed box dormers are not considered good design because they intrude on the roofscape and harm the character and appearance of buildings. Nonetheless, 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.

7. The box dormer is set up above the eaves but extends up to the roof ridge, rather than below it as advised in the SPD, with its roof lights visible above the roof ridge from the front of the house. It also extends across a side extension, the roof of which was raised to accommodate it, which the appellant acknowledges does not accord with the planning permission for the side extension. Part of the dormer roof extends beyond the roof ridge of the house, wrapping around the top of the hipped side section of the roof and is also visible from the front of the house. Consequently, the dormer dominates the rear roofscape altering the roof shape such that it appears out of balance with the adjoining property and out of character with the wider streetscape. The elements of it that are visible from the front of the house are incongruous and draw attention to its excessive size.
8. Overall, I conclude that the development harms both the character and appearance of the house and wider area, conflicts with the guidance in the SPD and does not accord with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013), Policy PSP38 of LP which only permits development of a high quality design that enhances local character and distinctiveness.

Other matter

9. I note the examples of other dormers provided by the appellant. However, none of them appear to be at a junction where they would be prominent in the street scene, as is the case with the appeal development. Also, I saw no other rear dormers within sight of the appeal property and, as a result, the development appeared particularly incongruous and out of character with houses in the immediate area. In any case, I have come to my own conclusion regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.
10. I have had regard to the neighbour's concern over the impact of the development on their roof top solar panels. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on the main issue for the reasons given above, I have not pursued this matter further.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR