



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3364335

Applecombe House, Horsley Road, Nailsworth, Gloucestershire GL6 0JZ

- 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 Miss Lucy Reynard against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application reference is S.25/0024/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is change of roof structure and dormer window to create gabled dormer. Block up existing front door with Cotswold stone.
-

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 proposed dormer window on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is an end terraced dwelling with a gable roof and a small gable dormer window to the front roof slope. It also has a side extension with a flat roof dormer window, but this is set in from the roof's extremities and is not significantly larger than the gable dormer. The other properties in the terrace feature a gable roof and modest gable dormer windows to the front roof slope. These reoccurring features give the roofscape of the appeal property and the terrace a consistency which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. While the proposed dormer window would have a gable roof design, due to its excessive scale, it would be a dominant and incongruous addition to the appeal property. It would appear unacceptably bulky compared to the modest gable dormer windows at the appeal property and the terrace and it would erode the consistency of the roofscape. The use of matching external materials would not be sufficient to assimilate the proposal amongst its surroundings.
6. I acknowledge that due to its flat roof, the dormer window to be replaced does not reflect the main roof form of the appeal property. Even so, this does not justify the proposal, since, for the reasons I have explained, would not be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the terrace.

7. I also observed Marton Cottage and Lakeview on my site visit. Marton Cottage is a gable fronted section of a building rather than a dormer window. The dormer windows at Lakeview are modest in scale compared to the appeal scheme. I also observed no other examples of dormer windows in the area that would justify the proposal. Overall, these examples do not justify the harm of the proposal.
8. The proposals also include the removal of the existing front porch and other alterations to the front elevation. The Council has not raised any objections to these elements, and I am satisfied that they would be reasonably in keeping with the existing property and would not add to any harm. This however does not diminish or overcome the concerns I have in respect of the dormer structure and does not alter my conclusions in respect of the harm that would arise therefrom.
9. Consequently, the proposed dormer window would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies HC8 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015), which require that extensions are in keeping with the character of the original dwelling and respect their surroundings.

Other Matters

10. The appeal site is near to Millbottom Mill (Now Ruskin Mill) and No 1, 2 and Bank Side (No 3), Millbottom which are Grade II listed buildings. While the effect to the listed buildings is not in dispute, I have a statutory duty under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (The Act), to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. Having considered the significance of the listed buildings, their distance to the appeal site and the localised harm of the proposal, the setting of the listed buildings would be preserved. Accordingly, there would be no harm to the significance of the heritage assets and no conflict with the statutory presumptions of the Act.
11. The appeal site is located within the Cotswolds National Landscape. While the effect to the National Landscape is not in dispute, great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes. Given that the harm of the proposal would be localised to the appeal site and its immediate context, no harm would arise to the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would be contrary to the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR