
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2017

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

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

Decision date: 18th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/17/3175221

131 East Dundry Road, Whitchurch, Bristol, BS14 0LP

- 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 and Mrs Pollinger against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00473/H, dated 23 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. 131 East Dundrey Road is one of a pair of semi-detached bungalows, each with a flat roofed dormer window to the front. It has a two storey rear extension with a flat roof at the same height as that of the flat roofed dormer which extends across the rest of the width of the rear of the house and the full width of the other one of the pair.
4. The proposal would enlarge the existing extension across the full width of the rear of No. 131 and project the same distance from the rear wall, to the same height as the flat roof of the dormer. I consider that the existing extension is not a wholly appropriate addition to the bungalow because of its boxy design and flat roof, and that the proposal, because of its size, design and location, would amount to a further incongruous and disproportionate addition to the building and would not respect its overall design and character.
5. Although it is not particularly large in itself, its cumulative effect, when combined with the existing extension, would result in a bulky element which would be out of scale with the relatively modest proportions of the bungalows. This would be exacerbated by the flat roof, the loss of the original eaves line and its extent across the full width of the bungalow to the common boundary.
6. I accept that the proposal would be at the rear of the property and not readily visible and that the existing first floor accommodation is limited in size. However, in my view, the proposal would be too wide and would wholly obscure

the original architectural character of the bungalow, to the detriment of the character of the host building and the area.

7. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character of the host building and the area, contrary to policies BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 (the Core Strategy) which requires new development to be of a high quality of design, and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 (the local plan) which requires, among other things, that extensions to buildings respect the design and character of the host building.
8. I consider that because of the proximity of the flank wall of the proposed extension to the boundary with the adjoining property, the proposal would have some impact on the outlook from the first floor rear window of that property in that it would appear overbearing. In this respect it would not be consistent with Core Strategy policy BCS21 and local plan DM30, insofar as they require development to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
9. I consider that the impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents would not be sufficient reason, on its own, to justify dismissing the appeal. However, it adds weight to my finding that the design, width and location of the proposed extension in close proximity to the common boundary would be unacceptable and contrary to policy.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR