



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2025 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3359221

196 Ellicks Close, Bradley Stoke, South Gloucestershire BS32 0EU

- 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 Faye Hood against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02032/HH.
 - The development proposed is described as a "Rising of existing roof to facilitate loft conversion with rear dormer. Single storey rear extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 196 Ellicks Close (no 196) is a two-storey detached house situated in a cul-de-sac, surrounded by similar properties. While some neighbouring dwellings feature modifications like single-storey rear extensions or solar panels, all retain their original roof shape and design. To the south, there are clear views of the property's rear elevation and roof from the adjacent nature reserve.
5. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the proposed single storey rear extension. From my observations on site, and the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree with this position. I shall therefore limit my assessment to the effect of the proposed dormer window.
6. Due to its excessive height, width and overall size, the proposed dormer would dominate the roof slope, creating a top-heavy and bulky appearance on the rear elevation of no 196. Consequently, the extended roof would become the most prominent feature of the rear elevation, sharply contrasting with neighbouring properties, all of which lack dormer windows. As a result, the development would appear incongruous, disrupting the uniformity of nearby roofscapes and harming the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area. Additionally, the use of composite cladding would harmfully contrast with existing

materials, and thus further increase the undue prominence of the dormer window, exacerbating the adverse impact of the proposed development.

7. The appellant cites two nearby properties featuring dormer windows as precedents. However, I have not been provided with the full details of these developments, particularly regarding the development plan in effect at the time of their approval. Regardless, from my observations on site and the available evidence before me, these examples are exceptions rather than the norm, as the overwhelming majority of nearby dwellings do not feature dormer windows.
8. I have also had regard to the development at 91 Ellicks Close and the appellant's claim that it was approved despite appearing incongruous in comparison with the surrounding properties. This development differs from the appeal proposal, as it involves a side extension rather than a dormer window, and is therefore not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. I have therefore ascribed very little weight to this example.
9. It has been asserted that the development's position, at the rear of a house at the end of a cul-de-sac and adjacent to a nature reserve, would prevent any detrimental impact on the street scene. However, I observed that no 196 is highly visible from public vantage points within the nature reserve. As a result, the development's harm and its incongruity with the surrounding rear roofscapes, which are largely free of dormer windows, would be particularly pronounced.
10. Given the above, the proposal would cause harm to the host property and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (Adopted December 2013) and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies Sites and Places Plan (adopted 2017). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure developments respect and enhance the character of a site, respond constructively to the buildings and characteristics of a locality and respect the existing building form and scale of the surrounding area. Additionally, it would also conflict with the Householder Design Guide SPD (adopted 2021) which requires the design and proportions of dormer windows to correspond to the host building.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge the support from the occupants of neighbouring dwellings for the development. However, this does not change my conclusion on the main issue or mitigate the harm it would cause, nor does it override the development's conflict with the development plan.
12. It is commendable that the appellant seeks to reach a resolution for the development and has stated they are committed to ensuring their plans adhere to the highest standards of design and planning. However, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. It is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Local Planning Authority and by interested parties at application stage.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, the development would cause harm to the appeal property and the surrounding area. Consequently, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR