
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/19/3235141
12 Swane Road, Bristol BS14 8NQ

- 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 Adam Comley against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/06517/F, dated 13 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1no. 3 bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached property located on a corner plot at the junction of Swane Road and Derricke Road. The area comprises a mixture of property types, but properties on Swane Road near to the appeal site are predominantly characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings. The appeal property has a large side garden, which given its position as a corner plot gives an open green feel to this location.
4. The appeal proposal is for the construction of a two-storey side extension to the existing dwelling which would form a new 3 bedroom dwelling that would have the same ridge and eaves height as the host dwelling, and the front elevation would also be in line with the existing.
5. The appeal site is in a prominent corner location, and the large side garden gives a pleasing open feeling to the street scene. By virtue of its scale and mass, the proposed development would, on this prominent corner location, erode the pleasing open attributes to the large side garden and bring the building line much closer to Derricke Road. Whilst I note there has been a single storey extension at 11 Swane Road opposite the appeal site, this has not eroded the openness of the corner plot as it is a single storey extension and has a reduced height, compared to the appeal proposal.
6. The appearance of the proposed dwelling would reflect the host dwelling in terms of its overall form, window appearance and through the use of similar

materials. However, these matters would not address that it would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area in respect of the loss of openness on the street corner.

7. The appellant has provided an appeal decision¹ for the development of a self-contained single dwelling at 1 Atkins Close, Stockwood. However, the Inspector in that case considered that development of a corner plot would not appear cramped or at odds with the existing pattern of development, which is different from the conclusions that I have reached. The site circumstances before me are quite different, for the reasons that I have set out, and it does not set a precedent. In any case, all applications and appeals must be determined on their own merits and that is what I have done in this case.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of semi-detached dwellings in the area which benefit from two storey extensions, including 1 and 2 Swane Drive, and 133 Derricke Road. These extensions are all set back from the front elevations of the dwellings and as such appear subservient to their host dwelling. This differs from the appeal proposal. Furthermore, the examples cited are not for new independent dwellings and are much smaller in scale to the appeal proposal. As such, their impact on the openness of the corner plots is much reduced.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy adopted June 2011, and policies DM26 and DM21 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Local Plan adopted July 2014. Together these seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high-quality design which positively contributes to an areas character.

Other Matters

10. I note that the proposal would provide an additional new house in an accessible location which would help to boost the supply of housing. However, a single dwelling would make little meaningful difference to this, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
11. I note that interested parties have raised concerns in respect of the level of on street parking, and the additional demand that a new dwelling in this location would create. The plans indicate that off street parking would be provided for the proposal, and I note that the highway authority has not raised any objections to the proposal.
12. The issues of impact on property values has also been raised. It is a well-founded principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as value of land or property. Thus, these matters do not add to my reasoning for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

¹ APP/Z0116/W/18/3205965

S Shapland

INSPECTOR