



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2025

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3359466

3 Queensholm Crescent, Downend, South Gloucestershire, BS16 6LP

- 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 and Mrs Campbell against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/01816/HH.
 - The development proposed is Addition of 2 small rear extensions and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There is a difference in the description of development between the planning application form and the Council's Notice of Decision. For the purpose of clarity, I have determined the application based on the description of development on the application form.
3. The appeal proposal also includes the installation of a roof window within the front roof slope of the property, together with the conversion of the garage into accommodation. None of these works are identified in the application form. However, as the works are included on the application drawings, I consider them to be included within the application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which occupies a prominent location close to the junction of Queensholm Crescent with Quakers Road. The roof form is a double hipped gable, with a higher and lower ridge line, formed by a section of the roof oversailing the front elevation to provide a roof over the two-storey projecting bay window.
6. The surrounding properties follow a similar pattern of development, though some have been modernised and extended, have been re-rendered or their render has been painted. The roof forms of the surrounding properties in the area are a strong design characteristic, primarily because of the presence of large oversailing eaves to provide roofs to double height bays, and many have double hipped gable roofs.

7. The appeal proposal would introduce a flat roofed box dormer to the rear elevation of the roof. Because of the height of the roof level of and the length of the proposed dormer, it would project above the level of the ridge line of the lower hip roof, and its' side gable would project well past the apex of the hip, changing the shape of the roof.
8. As a result, the dormer would be highly visible from the public realm on both Queensholm Crescent and Quakers Road and would harm the integrity of the double hip pattern of the existing roof. Whilst the side gable of the dormer would be finished in clay tile hanging, which would help to assimilate it materially with the existing roof, the use of a large fascia board to the top of the dormer gable wall, coupled to the location of the dormer gable, well past the apex of the hipped roof junction, would introduce an extremely visible and incongruous form in the street scene, causing harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
9. The design of the proposed dormer does not accord with the design principles for box dormers identified in the adopted Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guide (SPD), either in its dimensions, relationship to the ridge line, positioning on the roof slope or relationship to the principal elevation of the building.
10. The appellant has provided examples of other box dormer developments within the immediate area. I consider the example at 10 Queensholm Crescent is not comparable with the appeal proposal, that dormer being on a full gabled building in a less prominent location and is compliant with the design principles for box dormers within the Householder Design Guide SPD. The example at 41 Quakers Road is not compliant with the Householder Design Guide SPD and is visually intrusive in the street scene. For those reasons, I do not give these examples significant weight.
11. I therefore find the proposal to be contrary to Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (December 2013) (the Local Plan), and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies Sites and Places Plan (November 2017), which require, amongst other things, that development achieves high standards of design that respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the site and its context, in scale, form and materials.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has identified a fall-back position for a box dormer that would be achievable under permitted development rights. This would remain below the ridge line of the lower hipped gable roof, and the side gable of the dormer would not project past the apex of the hip. Such a proposal would be significantly less visible in the street scene than the proposal and would not cause the same level of harm to the character and appearance of the area.
13. The appeal proposal also includes the creation of single storey extensions to the rear of the property at ground floor, the conversion of the garage to residential accommodation and the installation of a roof window to the front roof slope.
14. The Council have found these elements of the proposal to be acceptable. Having examined these elements, I have also found them acceptable, though I note that the loss of the garage would require parking provision for 3 vehicles for the

extended property to be provided on the front parking apron. As this is a matter which could be addressed through the use of a condition, I do not consider it to be material to my decision.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposals would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and that there are no material considerations, including policies in the Framework, that would justify determining other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR