



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2019

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/18/3219277
635 Muller Road, Horfield, Bristol BS5 6XP

- 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 Hussain against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/04002/H, dated 24 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is two and single storey extension to side and single storey infill extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two and single storey extension to side and single storey infill extension to rear at 635 Muller Road, Horfield, Bristol BS5 6XP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/04002/H, dated 24 July 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: FP01J Existing and proposed elevations; FP02 Existing plans, and FP03 Proposed floor plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building and retained thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Muller Road is a predominantly residential street and a main route linking the north west area of Bristol to the M32. It is noticeably sloping within the immediate vicinity of the appeal property. The houses along Muller Road are generally formed of terraces of four, set behind short front gardens, with rear parking arrangements via access roads, which also break the built form. The appeal property is also adjacent to a large detached bungalow, the other side of the access road. Muller Road itself is wide, with footways on both sides

punctuated with deciduous street trees. Overall, this gives it an open and suburban character.

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey house, located adjacent to an access road. It has the predominant characteristics that feature along this section of Muller Road, however the property also benefits from a side garden and a rear garden significantly larger than the neighbouring properties. The gardens are surrounded by a wall and there is rear access into the garden from the access road. There is a significant amount of overlooking to the rear as gardens for houses along Tackley Road and Heyford Avenue adjoin those of Muller Road.
5. I note that the appellant has provided a summary of the planning history for the appeal property. There is an extant permission for a *'Two storey, family annexe to side and single storey, infill extension to rear'* (ref 17/07128/H). I have considered these proposals as a fallback position for the appellant, given the similarities with the appeal proposal. The appellant also states that the single storey rear infill extension would be permitted development.
6. Whilst the appeal proposals are larger than the existing permitted scheme, I do not consider the overall scale would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would narrow the gap between the appeal property and the adjacent bungalow, but there would still be clear separation as a result of the presence of the access road.
7. The appeal proposals have been designed to be subservient to the host dwelling, with reduced ridge heights and clear 'stepping' along the side elevation.
8. Overall, I do not consider the proposals to be in conflict with policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (CS), which seeks development that contributes to local character and reinforces local distinctiveness. Further, I do not consider there to be conflict with policies DM26 (Local Character and Distinctiveness); DM27 (Layout and Form) and DM30 (Alterations to Existing Buildings) of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (LP) document which seek development that respects the grain and dimensions of existing development more generally, as well as the host buildings, in respect of extensions.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission in the interests of certainty I have specified that the proposal be implemented in accordance with the approved plans.. A condition relating to materials is also necessary to ensure that the appearance of extensions are in accordance with policies BCS21 of the CS; DM26 and DM30 of the LP.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal is allowed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR