



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2017

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/17/3181709

13 Waterford Road, Henleaze, Bristol BS9 4BT

- 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 Mrs Kate Gritten against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01737/H, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey 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 the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No 15 with regard to their outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached property. The house, together with the attached semi-detached dwelling, forms a distinctive building in the street scene, primarily because of the large 'catslide' roofslopes which reach ground floor level at each side. The house is rendered white, as are the majority of the nearby dwellings, and has an unusual fenestration pattern on its front elevation and a distinctive porch.
4. The extension would be to the rear of the building. However it would project beyond the plane of the catslide roof and so would be visible from in front of the property. It would not be dominant in the street scene, but it would be clearly visible. Its projection beyond the roofslope, the flat roof design, and the use of timber cladding would contrast with the form, design and materials of the host dwelling, resulting in a visually incongruous addition when seen from the public realm and from many other neighbouring properties.
5. I accept that relative to the size of the house and garden, the extension would be subservient in scale, and that it is unlikely that the extension would detract from the symmetry of the block when seen from the front, as the extension would not be visible from the same positions as where the symmetry of the houses can be appreciated. Also I recognise the flat roof design would

minimise the impact on the neighbouring property and it would enable the continued use of solar panels on the house. Nevertheless, these considerations are substantially outweighed by the unsympathetic facets of the extension which would detract from the dwelling's distinctive character and appearance and hence unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the locality.

6. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy which, among other things, expects development to contribute positively to an area's character and reinforce local distinctiveness. It would also conflict with Policies DM26 and DM27 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP) which both generally seek to ensure development respects local character including the shape and form of existing development, and Policy DM30 of the SADMP which expects extensions to respect the form, materials and overall design of the host building. Similarly, it would fail to accord with the advice in the Supplementary Planning Document: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions which requires extensions to fit in with the detailed design and materials of the existing house.

Living conditions

7. The neighbouring dwelling at No 15 has some small ground floor windows close to the position of the proposed extension on its rear and side elevations. These do not appear to serve habitable rooms. There is a side facing window at first floor which I understand serves a bedroom, but this directly faces the catslide roof of the existing house and so its outlook would not be harmfully affected by the proposal. Similarly there are larger windows further along the rear elevation, but I do not consider the outlook from these windows would be significantly affected.
8. The extension would be close to the boundary with No 15 and would appear prominent from the neighbouring garden. However the part of their garden most greatly affected appears to mainly serve as the access from the house to the garage and garden, and not as an area in which the residents would necessarily linger. The majority of the garden would not be significantly overshadowed by the development.
9. As such, I do not consider the extension would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. In this respect therefore the proposal would accord with Policies BCS21, DM30 and the guidance in the SPD which all aim to ensure the amenity of existing development is maintained. However this does not outweigh the harm the extension would cause to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR