
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/19/3229635

Breaches Farm House, Cherwell Road, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 1QU

- 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 and Mrs P Baxter against the decision of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 18/04357/FUL, dated 28 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The postcode of the appeal site appears on the original application form as BS31 2QU but on the appeal form as BS31 1QU. The latter appears on all other mentions within the evidence and accordingly this is the one that I have used in the address above.
3. The Council's decision was made on the basis of amended plans submitted during the application process. The appellant has requested that the appeal be determined on the basis of the original plans submitted to the Council, not the amended plans. Although the original plans were subject to publicity and consultation, they are materially different to the scheme that was before the Council when it made its decision. To avoid potential for prejudice to the parties and interested parties, it is important that what I consider is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority. I have therefore determined this appeal on the basis of the plans listed in the Council's decision notice: Ref 05A, 07A, 08A, 09A.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

5. Cherwell Road is a residential street with the character defined by the mix of house types and materials, and there is no one dominant style of dwelling. The appeal site is unusual in that it is set back behind the neighbouring bungalow so the house does not front a road, although there is a driveway linking the site to Cherwell Road. While there is no strong building line, the host building and

its neighbours are all set back from the public footpath which runs along the front of the site. The lower part of the house and existing outbuildings are screened by fencing, while the upper part is visible from Cherwell Road above the roof of the bungalow. In public views it appears as a modestly sized dwelling with space around it.

6. The extension would project out to the front boundary of the site and occupy a significant proportion of the space in front of the existing dwelling. It would use similar materials, detailing and roof form to the existing dwelling and the ridge would be somewhat lower than that of the existing roof. I appreciate that the design has come about following discussions with the Council. Despite this, because of its height and depth the extension would be a substantial and bulky addition that would compete with the size of the existing dwelling and would not be subservient to it. The two storey blank gable end would be a prominent and excessively dominant feature from the footpath, where there are no other buildings of that scale in such close proximity. The overall effect of the scheme would be to unacceptably detract from the modest character and appearance of the host building.
7. As it is set back from Cherwell Road, the extension would not be prominent in the street scene and consequently its impacts would be localised. Because of the position of the site the extension cannot directly address the street, therefore relocating the entrance into the side of the extension would have no adverse visual impact. However, this does not outweigh the harm to the host building identified above.
8. For the reasons set out above, I find that the proposed extension would not complement or enhance the host building and would harm its character and appearance. It would therefore conflict with Policy D5 of the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking Plan¹ which requires well detailed building design. I therefore conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has directed me to two other extensions in the vicinity, which I viewed on my site visit. 16 Lambourn Road is a corner property with a two storey side extension allowed at appeal². That extension replaced a previous structure described as 'awkward and unattractive' by the Inspector, who found that the replacement would be much more harmonious with the host dwelling. This is materially different to the appeal site, where the small outbuildings that the proposed extension would replace are well screened and do not detract from the existing dwelling. As such, their removal would not justify the harm I have identified.
10. The other property at 10A Cherwell Road has a substantial front extension which I saw was under construction but largely externally complete. Due to the corner position of No 10A, its extension faces the road but is set back from it, with space around it. The immediate neighbour is of similar form but sited forward of the extension and they are seen together at the end of the street. While the design of that extension is very similar to the appeal scheme, the context in which they are seen is quite different and it does not result in the same harm. The setting and context of these extensions is therefore different

¹ Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan 2011-2029: Placemaking Plan (adopted July 2017)

² APP/F0114/D/10/2137292

to that of the appeal scheme. Each case must be considered on its own merits and they do not alter my decision.

11. The appellants' offer to incorporate wildlife enhancements is noted but such benefits would be minor and would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR