



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by S Hanson BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3227392

14 Priory Court Road, Henleaze, Bristol BS9 4DE

- 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 Ms J Campbell against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/0631/H, dated 3 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a rear and side single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposed extension would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, 16 Priory Court Road (No 16) with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms the right-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses. To the rear, the gardens are separated by a low wooden fence. The proposed single storey extension would wrap around the side and rear of the house. On the side elevation it would be set back from the front of the property and would extend some 1.4m towards the boundary with the neighbouring property to the south, leaving a gap for access to the rear garden. To the rear, the proposal would extend the width of the house, to the shared boundary with its semi-detached neighbouring property No 16.
4. Policy DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (LP) deals specifically with extensions and alterations to existing buildings and implements the requirements of Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) to deliver high quality buildings which, among other things, safeguard the amenity of existing development.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document Number 2, A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions 2005 (SPD), expands on the subject that development should not prejudice the amenities which occupiers of adjoining properties can reasonably expect to continue to enjoy. It says that any proposal should not significantly reduce the sunlight or daylight enjoyed by any habitable room of adjoining properties nor have an overbearing impact and adversely affect neighbouring amenities such as outlook.

6. To quantify this the SPD applies the maximum acceptability standard of 3.5m for the projection of a rear single-storey extension to semi-detached properties. The proposed single storey rear extension would be 3.6m deep exceeding the SPG guidelines for single storey rear extensions for semi-detached properties. The SPD also references the use of the 45 degree line as a 'rule of thumb' to seek to maintain a reasonable relationship between existing buildings and extensions; avoid an overbearing visual impact; and prevent excessive loss of light or overshadowing. Using this tool, the 'rule of thumb' measurement is breached both horizontally and vertically.
7. The proposed extension would be on the boundary with No 16 and because of its height, depth and shape of roof, the expanse of blank wall that would be visible above the boundary fence, would dominate and have a harmful effect on the occupiers of No 16 in terms of outlook. Additionally, because the rear elevation of No 16 is staggered, the proposal would create a sense of enclosure to this part of the house and garden. Furthermore, because of the proximity and orientation of the proposed extension, light levels entering the rear of No 16 would be reduced thereby causing harm to existing and future occupiers.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the combined depth, height and proximity of the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 16 in terms of outlook and light. The proposal would not accord with the overall protection given to neighbouring occupiers in terms of safeguarding amenity contained within Policy BCS21 of the CS and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the LP. Guidance in the Council's SPD as noted above has also been considered in reaching my decision.

Other Matters

9. The appellant comments that a single storey rear extension could be erected at the appeal property without the need for planning permission. Nevertheless, I am dealing with the proposal before me and have considered the proposed development in the context of the planning application plans and the relevant development plan policies.
10. There are examples of many houses in the surrounding area which benefit from extensions of differing forms and sizes. However, I am unaware of the precise details of these other examples and I have, in any event, considered this appeal on its own merits. The appellant refers to a similar extension that was approved and subsequently constructed to the neighbouring property No 12. Although this looks similar to the appeal proposal, there is a separation between No 12 and the appeal site and with a hipped roof, the extension, in my opinion, does not cause harm in terms of outlook and light levels even though the ground levels differ somewhat.
11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

S Hanson

INSPECTOR