



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025 by S Indermaur

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/D/25/3360115

99 Beauchamp Road, Walton Cardiff, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire GL20 7TA

- 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 Hall against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 24/00747/FUL.
- The development proposed is the retention of existing finishes to existing box dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the retention of existing finishes to existing box dormer at 99 Beauchamp Road, Walton Cardiff, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire GL20 7TA, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 24/00747/FUL and the plans submitted with it.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The development subject to the appeal has been undertaken. I have therefore considered the appeal retrospectively.
4. The Council have set out that the dimensions of the dormer are within the allowances of permitted development and a dormer of this size has previously been granted planning permission. The Council's concern relates to the external finish of the dormer. Notwithstanding the description of development above, the whole of the development is before me. However, given the planning history and the Council's reason for refusal, I have confined my recommendation to the consideration of the external finish of the dormer. I have no reason to form a different view on the other aspects of the dormer that are not in dispute.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is therefore the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the area with regard to its external finish.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling which is mainly constructed of red facing brickwork and dark coloured roofing materials. However, the property has a single storey rear extension that is externally finished in cream render, and

this matches the colour of the render used in the dormer. In addition, the surrounding dwellings are constructed from a mixture of materials, including both cream render finish and brick. This mixture of materials is a defining feature of the area. Whilst the dormer is positioned next to different materials on the rear of the property, it respects the materials used elsewhere on the host dwelling and in surrounding properties. Therefore, even though the dormer is prominent and visible from a number of vantage points, it does not detract from the overall quality of the area.

7. I conclude that the development does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the property. In this regard, the development complies with Policy RES10 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan (2019) and Policy SD4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (2017). Together, these Policies state that the design of development should complement and respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surroundings in terms of materials.

Conditions

8. Due to the retrospective nature of the appeal development and that there is no dispute that the development on the site reflects the submitted drawings, conditions relating to the commencement of development or requiring it to be constructed in accordance with the approved plans are not necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The development does not conflict with the development plan read as a whole. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR