



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/19/3233332

16 Sandringham Road, Stoke Gifford, BS34 8NR

- 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 Oliver Greenslade against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/3773/F, dated 5 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. Sandringham Road is part of a wider modern housing estate and wider suburban area located to the north of Bristol. The estate is mostly characterised by two storey terraces and semi-detached properties of similar and coherent scale and design, mostly brick but some finished in render (like the appeal property), set back from the highway with off road parking. The appeal property sits at the end of a terrace of 6 dwellings of consistent design, set back from the road and following a building line which reflects the curve of the road at this point.
5. The proposed two storey front extension would introduce a substantial and incongruous front gable feature at odds with the largely uniform character of the terrace and wider street scene. Whilst the extension would not project forward of the porch of No 22 (the property furthest forward of this particular terrace), its forward projection ignores the pattern of the development of the terrace, with its consistent stepped building line.

6. The appellant points to other extensions located nearby. I have limited information before me in respect of the planning permissions for these developments, whether they were considered under the same policies for example, and in any event, I have considered the proposal on the merits of the case. It is noted that the development complies with a 45 degree line when drawn from the adjoining neighbour, however impact upon the living conditions of the neighbours is not a matter in dispute.
7. As such, it is concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area. There would therefore be conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2027 and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan Adopted November 2017, which collectively require development to reach a high standard of design which is informed by and respects site character. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127), which, amongst other matters, requires development to be sympathetic to local character, visually attractive and add to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR