



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/D/25/3369417

Mulberry House, 6 Polysend Drive, Alderton, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, GL20 8PU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Cooper against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00294/FUL.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof conversion involving increase in ridge height and installation of front and rear dormer extensions to existing detached garage to provide ancillary accommodation within the roof space. Installation of external stairs to serve converted roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene as well as the openness of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a residential area which benefits from a detached double garage to the side of the property, set back from the road, behind the driveway to the property. The site is located within a newly constructed residential estate, is within the Special Landscape Area and I noted, at the time of my site visit, that both the dwellings and garages within the estate demonstrate a consistent character and appearance in terms of design, scale and massing. The proposal seeks to undertake a hip to gable roof conversion involving an increase in ridge height, as well as the installation of front and rear dormer extensions, to allow the existing detached garage to provide ancillary accommodation within the roof space (not independent accommodation). The materials are proposed to match that of the existing building.
5. The appeal site is located within a residential estate which is consistent in terms of character and appearance of the garages which would have been a part of the design process for the overall development. Existing, detached, double garages feature hipped roofs, whilst single garages, such as that adjacent to the appeal site, are gable ended. The overall approach assists to maintain a sense of consistency and openness throughout the street scene which is defined by detached dwellings with distinct gaps on either sides, with the detached garages positioned within

these spaces. The appeal site faces onto open fields, and I found, at the time of my site visit, that the appeal site is located within a highly visible location as a result of clear views into the estate from both Willow Bank Road and the B4077. From these viewpoints into the estate the sense of uniformity and consistency, and subservience to the host dwellings, with regard to the garages, is a notable feature.

6. The proposal, as outlined above, seeks to increase the ridge height and convert the roof from a hipped to a gable design and I find that the increased height and altered roof form would be uncharacteristic and visually alien for a double garage within the estate within the clear views available of the appeal site. The proposal would remove the open aspect currently provided as a result of the characteristic hipped roof design which, combined with the increase in height, would result in a more imposing and dominant structure. The increased height, and change to the roof design, would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. I note, as part of my site visit, that dormer windows are not a characteristic feature of the estate which means that the front dormers, and a rear box dormer, would be out of character with the surrounding development. I find that the rear of the proposal would be visually prominent within Polysend Drive from the north with views available over the play area/equipment to the side of the road and into the rear of the appeal site enabling clear views of the rear of the host property and the garage building in question. Cumulatively, the proposals would add further massing and visual complexity to what is currently a subservient outbuilding in the context of the host dwelling itself and one which is, in terms of design, intentionally consistent with the design of other double garages within the estate. Overall, I find that the proposal would appear prominent when read in conjunction with the host dwelling, within the street scene and within wider views as outlined above.
8. I note, from the appellant's statement, that it is stated that the hipped garage is proposed to become gable ended to match the neighbouring garage, however, as outlined and as confirmed by the Council, gable ended garages are characteristic of single garages within the estate whereas double garages are specifically noted, and designed, to be hipped. It is stated that there are dormer windows already within the development, however, the only dormer windows I saw at the time of my site visit, were small dormer windows facing onto Willow Bank Road between Fletcher Close and Brentyard Close/to the rear of Fletcher Close – and not on Polysend Drive within views of the appeal site. Dormer windows of the nature proposed before me (most notably a box dormer) are not characteristic and would therefore be an alien addition in terms of the established character of the estate.
9. I do not find that the extended garage would be difficult to see as a result of being back within the site (when viewed from the Public Right of Way) in comparison to the two houses. At the site visit, as outlined above, I found that the proposal was readily visible within views beyond the appeal site boundary and that the proposal would be visually prominent and could not be considered minor due to the cumulative visual impact of the proposals which I have identified. I do not find that the setback, from the road, would be sufficient to justify the proposal being described as hidden. The overall height of the proposal may have been reduced in comparison to previous applications; however, I have considered the proposal that is before me based upon its own merits and the evidence that is before me.
10. I find that the proposal would disrupt the established design and character of the street scene and result in a garage being prominent in views as a result of an

incongruous addition. I find this would cause undue visual harm to the street scene, erode the sense of space which contributes to the quality of the development and would result in unnecessary visual harm and loss of openness to the area due to failing to respect the established character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate vicinity.

11. The proposal would be contrary to Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2017 Policy SD4 which requires new development to respond positively to, and respect the character of, the site and its surroundings in terms of mass and form and Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2022 Policy RES10 which permits proposals for the extension and alteration of existing dwellings provided that the detailed design reflects or complements the design and materials of the existing dwelling, the scale of the proposal is appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its surrounding area and the proposal respects the character and appearance of surrounding development. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which requires developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. I note third-party comments/objections in relation to the proposal with regard to loss of privacy as well as loss of views. The Council does not raise an issue with regard to privacy of neighbouring occupiers, and I note that the Council has specifically considered the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings within their delegated report. Based upon the information before me, and my site visit, I have no reason to conclude differently on such matters, and I do not find that the proposal would result in undue impact upon residential amenity which would warrant refusal. Comments with regard to loss of views are noted, however, issues such as loss of a view, or negative effect on the value of properties, are not material considerations.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR