



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 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/W/19/3227285

226 Sturminster Road, Bristol BS14 8EP

- 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 D Broomfield against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00524/F, dated 1 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension to form two flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the area and ii) the living conditions of both existing and future occupiers in terms of the provision of outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace two-storey dwelling on a prominent and open corner plot, which allows views towards the properties in Cowling Drive to the rear. It is located on the junction with Sturminster Road, a busy main distributor road and Tibbott Road, a quieter residential route within the Stockwood area of Bristol. The property's main façade faces Tibbott Road although access is gained from Sturminster Road. The house is surrounded on three sides by garden and bordered by a low rendered wall to the front and a medium height hedge to the Tibbott Road side. To the rear a low wooden fence separates the appeal site from the neighbouring property. The appeal property occupies a large plot due to its position on the corner of two roads.
4. The surrounding area is primarily short terraces and semi-detached two-storey dwellings of a similar style and symmetry. Design features include wide casement windows, low profile concrete pantiled roofs and centrally located front doors over which is a simple canopy porch. The properties are set back from the road with a modest area to the front that provides off-road parking for many of the houses.
5. The proposal to extend the appeal property to the side and to the rear would provide a self-contained one-bedroom flat at both ground and first floor level. The front door for the existing property would be relocated to the front

elevation and the existing window in this elevation removed to form the new party wall. The garden area would be subdivided at the rear to provide a small private outdoor area for each of the proposed flats and the remaining house. One parking space, accessed from Tibbot Road would be provided to the rear of the plot for use by occupiers of the house. No parking spaces would be provided for the flats. The area of garden to the side of the proposed flats would remain open. The flats would be accessed via a new doorway in the front elevation and a new doorway in the side elevation.

6. To provide the proposed accommodation, the width of the end of terrace house would need to be extended significantly. This would visually unbalance the symmetry of the row of houses and would breach the existing building line with the neighbouring properties which face Tibbott Road, harming both the street scene and the open nature of the corner. To the rear, the full width of the extension to the property would be added to with a low profiled gable roofed projection. The proposal would cover a large proportion of the side garden area, enclosing the current open vistas to the rear. With regard to each of these, the proposed development would fail to respect the prevailing established character and appearance of the area.
7. The development as proposed would be contrary to Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted 2011) (Core Strategy), which among other matters, expects development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness. Policies DM26 and DM27 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (adopted 2014) (SADMP Plan) expand this requirement specifying how proposals should, among other matters, reflect patterns, proportions, building lines and layout.

Living conditions

8. The proposed extension of the existing dwelling to provide two flats would incorporate a large section of the garden leaving a reduced area to be split between the three properties. Each property would have a limited outdoor recreational space that would also provide room for bicycle and bin stores.
9. The existing dwelling would have a garden measuring 53 square metres (sqm), in addition to 22 sqm of space to the front. With regards to the two one-bedroom flats, these would be provided with 28 sqm (ground floor) and 21 sqm (first floor) of private outdoor space respectively. In addition to the areas to the rear of the property, there would be 75 sqm of garden area to the front/side. Although this is of a more generous size, it is unclear of how and by whom it would be utilised. Nevertheless, the Council considers that the size of both private rear gardens fails to provide adequate and usable outdoor private space for future residents and I have no reason to disagree.
10. Although the Council has no adopted minimum amenity space standards, I consider the development as proposed would not comply with the essence of Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy, which among other things, expects proposals to safeguard the amenity of existing development and create spaces that are adaptable. Additionally, the proposal would not comply with Policy DM27 of the SADMP Plan which expands this requirement specifying how proposals should, among other things, provide adequate appropriate and usable private amenity space. The Council referenced Policy DM29 of the

SADMP in its reason for refusal, however, this policy does not refer to private outdoor space requirements.

Other Matters

11. A recent planning decision¹ has been brought to my attention detailing an alternate scheme. As this is a materially different proposal, it has no implications for my conclusion.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Hanson

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning Application Ref 19/01956/F