



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2017

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/17/3169883

100 The Worthys, Bradley Stoke, Bristol, BS32 8DQ

- 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 Steven Maclean-Walker against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref PT16/5263/F, dated 13 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey and two storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation; erection of front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey and two storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation; erection of front porch at 100 The Worthys, Bradley Stoke, Bristol, BS32 8DQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PT16/5263/F, dated 13 September 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary matters

2. Since it more accurately describes the proposed development I have used the description found in the Council's decision notice rather than that in the original application form.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, a detached dwelling, stands within a large, fairly modern residential housing estate. The estate displays a variety of house types, but the The Worthys frontages to the south of the appeal property are characterised by detached dwellings, albeit that most stand on narrower plots than the appeal site.
 5. Alongside the dwelling, but separated from it, stands a double garage. The appellant wishes to extend above it, and just over a year ago contacted the Council for pre-application (PRE) advice. The advice proffered is summarized in the Officer report on the application as follows:
-

- *Ensure the proposed first floor garage extension is subordinate to the existing dwelling.*
 - *Build an infill extension between the dwelling and garage to make the proposal more integral with the surrounding properties.*
 - *Reduce the size of the first floor garage extension.*
6. I have not seen the proposals subject of the original PRE submission, and I am not therefore in a position to know whether the size of the first floor garage extension was reduced, as advised. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the appellant's modified proposals reasonably follow the thrust of the Council's original guidance, which presumably took into account the property's relative prominence within the estate.
7. In this regard, an infill extension has been included, which links to the garage, and this structure would be clearly subservient to the host property in terms of its ridge height. This perceived subservience would be accentuated by the infill extension's setback from the host property's front elevation. The adoption of a hipped roof arrangement, as proposed, would assist in two ways, by reducing the perceived bulk of the additions and in maintaining a sense of separation between the extended property and the neighbouring property, No.102.
8. Although the proposals, taken as a whole, would elongate the original dwelling, the design is such that the host property would retain its visual dominance and integrity. The proposed porch is modest and visually appropriate. The proposals do not, in my view, amount to an overdevelopment, as alleged by the Council. On the contrary, if built, they would sit acceptably in their visual context.
9. I conclude that the proposed development is well designed and would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, the proposals comply with those provisions of policies CS1 of the Council's Core Strategy requiring the design of development to respect and enhance the character distinctiveness and amenity of both the site and its context.

Conditions

10. The Council's suggested condition in respect of materials shall be imposed in the interests of visual amenity.
11. It is also necessary in the interests of certainty that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Other matters

12. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, including the references to the *National Planning Policy Framework*, but no other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: the OS location plan and Drawing No. 18206/16-1b.