

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 09 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/17/3166874

12 Homelea Park West, Newbridge, Bath BA1 3HR

- 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 Bernard Whishaw against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
 - The application ref: 16/05407/FUL, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extend approved proposal 16/02837/FUL by 30 cm'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 12 Homelea Park West, Newbridge, Bath BA1 3HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/05407/FUL, dated 3 November 2016 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan at 1:500 scale, block plan at 1:500 scale, existing plans and elevations, proposed plans and elevations drawing annotated with 'minor amendment shaded blue', and proposed plot and roofs drawing annotated with 'minor amendment shaded'.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. On the application form the scheme is described as 'extend approved proposal 16/02837/FUL by 30 cm'. On the appeal form it is described as 'erection of two storey side extension'. Whilst I have had regard to the property's planning history in my decision, it forms no part of this development, and consequently I have taken the description from the appeal form, albeit with the omission of the words 'erection of' which are superfluous.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. Homelea Park West is a short cul-de-sac of hipped-roofed, two storey semi-detached dwellings which are in a similar style, and faced predominantly with stone and render. Where they have two storey side extensions, these are generally set well-back from the host dwelling's front face, and set down from its ridge line.
5. The appeal property ('no. 12') forms one half of a semi-detached pair, which adheres to the general style of other properties in the road. Its attached neighbour at no. 11 does not have a two storey side extension. No. 12 has a rather unusual layout in this road in that it is the end plot with a large triangular side garden which makes its flank wall prominent in the streetscene.
6. The proposed extension would be recessed only slightly from no. 12's front face. However, that set back, together with the host's stone quoin detailing, would be sufficient to provide some articulation. The proposal's roof, which would match the form of the host, would be significantly set down at ridge level. At approximately 4m, the extension's front face would be significantly shorter than the front face of the host. For all those reasons the scheme would appear reasonably subservient to the existing dwelling and would not significantly unbalance this semi-detached pair. Its broadly similar form and the use of matching materials would ensure that it would respect the existing building's appearance.
7. No. 12 already has permission for a two storey extension (Ref: 16/02837/FUL). The parties agree that that approved scheme is just 0.3m shorter than this proposal. In my view, compared to the approved scheme, the very minimal additional width proposed here would be largely imperceptible in the streetscene, and would have a very marginal impact on views of the flank wall from the north-west. Although this extension would be wider and would have less of a set-back than others that I observed in this street, that planning history, and this plot's unusual layout, support my conclusion that it would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
8. In general terms policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including minerals and waste policies) 2007 set out that development will be permitted where it responds to local context, where the character of the public realm is maintained, and, in the case of extensions, where their appearance respects and complements the host building. For the reasons above the scheme would not conflict with those policies in the adopted development plan. It would also accord with the broadly similar requirements of emerging policies D1, D2, D3 and D5 of the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking Plan – District-wide Strategy and Policies. The appeal will therefore be allowed.

Conditions and conclusion

9. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered the Council's suggestions against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard time limit condition, as it provides certainty, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings.
10. Finally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be faced in materials to match those in the host building.
11. For the above reasons the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR