



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/D/25/3371703

Penrose House, 30 Sydenham Road North, Cheltenham, GL52 6EB

- 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 Peter Harrison against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00618/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 30 Sydenham Road North is a two storey detached house located on a corner plot between Sydenham Road North and Cranham Road in the Sydenham Character Area (the SCA) of the Cheltenham Central Conservation Area. The SCA contains a mix of architectural styles and age of buildings and No. 30 is an example of a formal villa style constructed in the 19th century. Although it is not a listed building, it is identified in the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal as a positive building. It is in a relatively prominent location on the corner, well spaced centrally in its plot and set back from the road. It has a two storey element to the rear with a monopitch roof.
4. The Council raises no objection to the single storey side extension and I see no reason to disagree with this view.
5. The relevant adopted policies in this case include D1 of the Cheltenham Plan (2020), and SD4 and SD8 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (2017) (the Core Strategy). These relate to design requirements, including reference to the architectural integrity of buildings, scale, materials and historical context and the maintenance of heritage assets. Also relevant are the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Alterations and Extensions* (the SPD) which offers design advice and the *Sydenham Character Area Appraisal and Management Plan* (the CAA).
6. There is a statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of

preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) states that in the consideration of development proposals great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets in accordance with the significance of the asset and any harm should require clear and convincing justification.

7. I consider that the proposed dormers are unacceptable because of their scale, form and materials. The existing building has a relatively shallow roof pitch and the dormers would appear large and bulky. They would fill much of three of the roof pitches because of their width and their minimal set down from ridge and up from the eaves. Although they would not necessarily give the appearance of an additional storey, they would give the building a top heavy appearance on the skyline which would compromise the architectural integrity of the building. The use of white render, especially for the cheeks, although in keeping with the main house would make them more evident.
8. I have taken account of the examples of loft conversions in the area put forward by the appellant. Many of the dormer windows visible nearby are typically smaller both in real terms and as a proportion of the roof slopes and overall mass of the host buildings. They tend to be of materials more suited to blending in with the host roof, though not all are wholly successful in this respect. Several of these properties have different original roof forms and steeper roof pitches than No. 30.
9. The CAA refers to some dormer windows in the Sydenham Character Area as having a negative impact on the skyline and built form of the historic buildings. In my view this indicates that special care needs to be taken over the introduction of new dormers in the area.
10. Due to the prominent position of No. 30 on a corner and its spacious setting within its plot, the proposed dormers would all, including that on the southeast side elevation, be readily visible from the street, even when the trees are in leaf. I consider that the size and form of the proposed dormers, especially the rear one, would be out of proportion with the original shallow roof form and unsympathetic to the overall architectural style of the building. Their cumulative effect would create a discordant feature which would detract from the character of the building itself and the wider street scene and would fail to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
11. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area. I give considerable weight to this harm and although there would be benefits to the living standards of the occupiers of the property, no public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm is apparent from it and I find no clear and convincing justification for allowing the appeal.
12. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the house and of the street scene and would fail to conserve or enhance the conservation area. It is contrary to policies D1 of the Cheltenham Plan and SD4 and SD8 of the Core Strategy. It is contrary to the SPD and the aims expressed in the CAA and not in accordance with the Framework.
13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe INSPECTOR