



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/17/3179788
116 Repton Road, Bristol BS4 3LZ

- 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 G Coomer against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01486/F, dated 16 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is to erect a two bedroom two storey dwelling attached to 116 Repton Road, Bristol.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (a) the living conditions of occupiers of 116 Repton Road and (b) on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The appeal relates to an end of terrace two storey house on a wide plot that incorporates a side garden with a garage at the back of this. The proposal is to erect a two storey house in the side garden attached to the existing house. It would be set substantially behind the front wall of other houses in the terrace to enable two parking spaces to be provided in the front garden. The house would project beyond the original rear wall of no.116 by approximately 3m at first floor level and by about 4.4m at ground floor level. There is a rear conservatory at the host property and the proposal would project some 1.4m beyond this.
4. Supplementary Planning Document no. 2 - A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005) (SPD2) is a relevant consideration as the impact of the proposal on the host property would be similar to that of a neighbour's extension. This indicates that two storey rear extensions are unlikely to be acceptable with a depth beyond 2.75m as they can result in unreasonable loss of light or outlook or a detrimental sense of enclosure. Whilst the proposal would be in excess of this depth at first floor level, it would satisfy a rule of thumb test in the SPD not to cross a 45° line (on plan and elevation) projected from the doors to the conservatory.

5. Policy DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 (SADM) requires extensions and alterations to existing buildings to safeguard the amenity of the host premises and neighbouring occupiers and to leave sufficient usable external private space for the occupiers of the building. Policy DM27 of the SADM relates to the layout and form of all buildings and amongst other matters requires existing and proposed development to achieve appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight.
6. The proposed house would be located to the south of the host property. The combined effect of the projections at ground and first floor level would result in some overshadowing of the nearest first floor bedroom window and to the conservatory. There would also be some effect on outlook from these rooms. The development would have an oppressive effect on living conditions at the host property which would be exacerbated by the short rear garden depth of the terraced houses and the limited width that would remain. In these respects the proposal would be contrary to policies DM27 and DM30 and to SPD2.
7. I note that there have been previous refusals of permission for a similar development at the site and that the depth of the current proposal has been reduced to address concerns raised. I also note that the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 would enable extensions of a comparable scale to the proposal to be erected under permitted development allowances, albeit that the ground floor extension would have to be subject to the specified prior approval procedures. However, these factors do not lead me to a different conclusion in relation to the harm to living conditions and the conflict with relevant planning policies.

Character and appearance

8. The site is at a pivotal position in the street where the character changes from terraced houses sited close to the road with no off street parking to semi-detached houses on wider plots with off street parking to the side of the dwellings. The substantial set back from the front wall and reduced ridge height would give the proposal a subservient appearance in relation to the host building. The proposal whilst located also a little behind the front wall of the adjacent semi-detached house 118 Repton Road would act as a transitional development between the two character areas. The design would include a hipped pitched roof and front facing gable at roof level that would reflect features on adjacent dwellings and help assimilation into the street scene.
9. Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy promotes the delivery of high quality urban design with developments contributing positively to an area's character and identity. Policy DM27 of the SADM requires the layout, form, pattern and arrangement of buildings to contribute to the creation of quality urban design and to make efficient use of land. The proposal would make efficient use of land and as a transitional development would accord with these policies.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to policy BCS5 of the Core Strategy in relation to the provision of new residential development and the need for the Council to provide new dwellings on 'windfall' sites such as the appeal site. The proposal would make a small contribution towards housing need. It would provide a small dwelling with a floor area in compliance with the nationally

described space standards minimum floor areas. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to living conditions.

11. I have noted the concerns expressed by local residents against the proposal, some of which have been considered above. The Council have not objected to the proposal in relation to the other matters raised such as parking provision and the ability to turn into the carriageway from the site. I have no reason to disagree with their findings.
12. It is inevitable that some noise and disturbance will result from building operations, but this would be for a temporary period and would not be sufficient reason to withhold permission. I note that such disturbance could aggravate the health care of a local resident close to the site. Whilst personal matters are a material consideration, they do not usually outweigh the findings on the main issues and in this instance would not be sufficient reason to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regards to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 116 Repton Road and would conflict with relevant development plan policies. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR