
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 02 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/17/3171191

1 Hazel Grove, Bristol, BS7 0NG

- 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 Geoff Clarke against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01225/H, dated 1 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "narrow two storey side extension to extend ground floor hall and include study while extending first floor bedroom and bathroom. Garage to side of extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the plans listed by the Council as having been formally considered as part of the application. However, I have also received copies of revised sketches submitted by the appellant. The evidence on file suggests that, whilst they were not cited on the Decision Notice, these sketches were before the Council at the time the decision was made. The revised sketches show a minimal set back from the host dwelling and, as per the original plans, there would be no step down in respect of the roof ridge height. The amendments would, therefore, not be sufficient to overcome the harm I have identified below.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is part of a semi-detached pair of red-brick houses which occupies a corner plot at the junction of Hazel Grove and Toronto Road. The pair is one of four extremely similar semi-detached pairs sited between the intersections of Hazel Grove with Toronto Road and Montreal Avenue. The large adjoining garden areas to each corner plot give the street a sense of openness.
5. The proposal is to construct a two storey side extension and a single storey double garage. The proposed side extension would not be set back from the front wall or set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling and as a consequence would not appear subservient. The extension would also have the

effect of unbalancing the semi-detached pair of which it is part; thus harming the visually attractive symmetry which characterises this part of the street scene.

6. The proposed garage would also not be set back from the main dwelling and would create a built form which occupies the entire width of the plot in which it sits. I note the Council do not object to this element of the proposal. In my view, the proposed garage would exacerbate the imbalance created by the two storey extension and would remove some of the openness which characterises the corner plots.
7. For the reasons outlined above I consider that the proposed development would be in conflict with the aims of policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy (June 2011), policies DM26 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (July 2014) and the guidance contained within Supplementary Planning Document Number 2. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that new development contributes positively to an area's character and identity, respects and responds appropriately to the local pattern and architectural characteristics and that any extensions respect the character and design of the host building to which they should be physically and visually subservient.
8. I acknowledge the varied character of the wider area and during my site visit I noted a number of examples which the appellant considered similar to the proposal; including those at 10 Hazel Avenue and 54, 60 and 70 Toronto Road. These examples are, however, situated within different contexts and are not directly comparable as the immediate street scene within which the appeal property sits has a distinctive character and appearance. The character of Toronto Road, particularly, is markedly different. In any event, each case must be treated on its own merits and the existence of other examples does not alter my findings of harm in this case.
9. I note the appellant's suggestion that a sense of subservience could be created through a careful use of materials. In my view, this would not be sufficient to mitigate the harm I have identified. The different materials would in fact sit uncomfortably with the prevailing brick and cause further harm to the character and appearance of the property.
10. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issue and all other matters raised, including the personal circumstances of the appellant's son, in respect of which I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed

L J O'Brien

APPOINTED PERSON