



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 09 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/17/3179715

97 Finch Road, Chipping Sodbury, South Gloucestershire BS37 6JD

- 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 Andrew Febry against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref PK17/1239/F, dated 17 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension to provide an extended lounge and WC to ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is on a 'Radburn-style' estate, where the vehicular accesses to the rear are clearly segregated from the pedestrian walkways and green spaces to the front. From those walkways there are views looking along the front faces of the dwellings across the largely open frontages.
4. The dwellings on this part of Finch Road are semi-detached and are laid out in a regular pattern. To the front they have a largely consistent form and fenestration, with common facing materials and detailing, such as hanging tiles on their vertical faces between ground and first floor. Notwithstanding some alterations, including occasional front extensions, those characteristics give this part of the estate a cohesive and attractive appearance.
5. The proposal would extend a relatively modest distance of approximately 1.8m from No. 97's front face. However, unlike some nearby extensions, such as at 101 Finch Road, it would span almost the entirety of the front elevation. The lean-to roof would result in the loss of most of the characteristic hanging tiles. Although the dwelling is set down from the walkway, the scheme would be prominent in public views looking across the frontages. In those views it would significantly disrupt the rhythm and uniformity of this row.

6. Alterations and extensions have resulted in some changes to the Estate's original appearance. However, although there are a few nearby examples of front extensions, those that I observed did not span the width of the ground floor as proposed here. Whilst the appellant maintains that those shorter extensions are more disruptive to the rhythm of the streetscene, in my view, the larger size of this scheme would result in a more dominant impact on the host dwelling and the area. Additionally, although the scheme would be simply-designed, and finished with matching brickwork and tiles, compared to those examples, more of the original detailing would be lost.
7. Amongst other matters and in general terms, Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 and Policy H4 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan 2006 require that development is informed by, and respects, the character and distinctiveness of the site, the existing property, and the area. That with regard to matters including siting, scale and design. The scheme would conflict with those policies.
8. I note that there were no representations objecting to the proposal. However, as it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, it would conflict with the development plan. Consequently, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR