



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2017

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/17/3177981

32 Creswicke Road, Knowle, Bristol, BS4 1UD

- 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 Craig Kingdon against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00578/H, dated 20 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Amended plans were submitted to the Council before it made its decision but it is not clear whether these were considered. The amended plans show only a reduction in the size of a proposed single storey front extension. No party would therefore be prejudiced by my determining the appeal on the basis of the amended plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: (i) The effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and (ii) The effect of the proposed parking arrangement on the safety of pedestrians.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. 32 Creswicke Road is a two storey semi-detached property to which it is proposed to add a two storey side extension. It is generally good practice for side extensions to such properties to be set back from the main front elevation and set down from the main ridgeline. This is to ensure they are subservient to, and respect the original design and balance of the pair of semi-detached properties. Supplementary Planning Document Number 2, A Guide for Designing House Alternations and Extensions (2005) (SPD) echoes this advice and sets out that a minimum set back of 1m at first floor should be provided.
5. The proposed extension before me would have a set back of approximately 0.4m. The appellant argues that this is sufficient to provide subservience. However I disagree. A set back of 0.4m would do very little to reduce the visual prominence of the side elevation, which would appear more or less as prominent as the main front elevation. I therefore consider that the 0.4m set

back proposed is not sufficient to achieve a subservient design. As a result the side extension would appear overly dominant to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the pair of semi-detached properties to which it belongs.

6. The appellant states that there are many examples of less than 1m set back extensions. I saw on my site visit that 28 Creswicke Road had a side extension with no set back. However, there were no other such extensions in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site that my attention was drawn to. Planning permission granted for a 0.5m set back at 116 Falcondale Road is also referred to but I do not have the full details of this before me in order to make any meaningful comparisons. In any event, it does not provide an immediate context to the appeal site. I therefore do not consider that these justify the proposal given the harm I have found.
7. The Council also raise concern over the width of the single storey front extension which incorporates a porch and store. The amended plans have sought to break this up by setting back the store element. However, the front projection of the porch and front projection of the store to the side, albeit set back, would still give the impression of a wide expanse of single storey front extensions. Together these would dominate the original dwelling again resulting in harm to its character and appearance.
8. For the above reasons the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area contrary to Policies BCS21 of the Core Strategy (2011) (CS), DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (SADMP) and the SPD. These require high quality urban design that respects the form and overall design of the host building. Policy DM30 also specifically requires extensions to be physically and visually subservient to the host building.

Pedestrians

9. Currently No 32 has space for a car to be parked off of the road. The amended plans would allow space in excess of the Council's required standard parking space of 2.4m x 4.8m to the front of the proposed side extension. It is therefore unlikely that a car parked here in the future would overhang the adjacent pavement. I therefore find no conflict with Policies BCS10 of the CS or DMD23 of the SADMP which require development to be designed to ensure safe streets.

Conclusion

10. Whilst I have found no harm in terms of the safety of pedestrians, I do find harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. For this reason, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR