



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019

**by H Porter BA(Hons) MScDip IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28 November 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/19/3236781**

**92 Lays Drive, Keynsham BS31 2LE**

- 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 & Mrs D Nash against the decision of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
  - The application Ref 19/02002/FUL, dated 5 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
  - The development proposed is to build a two storey rear extension to the house.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural matter

2. During the course of the appeal, the Council confirmed that reference was made to an incorrect drawing within its appeal statement. I have considered the appeal in light of drawing 2114-03N as the drawing upon which the Council made its decision and on which interested parties' views were sought.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. The Council has previously granted planning permission for the extension of the appeal building. Subsequently consent was sought and refused for a two-storey side and rear extension; an appeal was lodged and this was dismissed in January 2019 (APP/F0114/D/18/3216564) (the January appeal).
5. The appeal building is a two-storey dwelling situated in a late 20<sup>th</sup> century residential suburb in Keynsham. Built form locally is characterised by a consistency in scale, material and house design, while even spacing of houses emphasises plot rhythm and layout. The undeveloped spaces that separate buildings, and the visual alleviation they provide, add to the cohesiveness of the local development pattern and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area as a spacious and carefully planned suburb.
6. Like the Inspector determining the January appeal, I similarly find that the appeal building fits comfortably within the street scene and respects the

rhythm and spacing of buildings that define the local context. That Inspector also found that the first-floor side extension would significantly erode the first-floor gap between the host dwelling and 94 Lays Drive and would disrupt the simple visual rhythm and spacing of buildings within the street scene. The impact of the two-storey rear extension in that previous scheme was considered to be slight.

7. The latest iteration would extend to the rear at two storeys and include a single-storey extension beyond this, that would wrap around to the garage at the side of the dwelling. The extant proposal is materially different to that being considered by the January appeal Inspector; notably the first-floor side extension has been omitted, while the depth of the two-storey rearwards extension would be increased by a further metre.
8. The roof of the single-storey extension as it wraps to the side would reach above the flat roof of the extant garage and infill some of the intervening space above it. To some degree this aspect of the scheme would infill the intervening side gap between the appeal building and No. 94 Lays Drive. However, given the scale of the extended roof pitch and the way it would be set back within the plot, the impact would not be unduly obvious in itself.
9. That said, in combination with the extent of the two-storey rearwards extension now being proposed, the appeal scheme would alter the appeal building considerably. Bearing in mind the staggered footprint of the building and its relationship with Number 90 Lays Drive, the two-storey extension would add significant overall bulk. The increased building depth would be perceptible from the street, particularly when viewed on approach from the east. The cumulative impact of the scheme would be to undermine the simple visual rhythm and spacing of buildings within the street scene that the previous Inspector sought to avoid.
10. The combination of the side extension and the significant scale of the two-storey rear extension would erode substantially the extent of undeveloped space around the host dwelling. Indeed, the proposal would dominate the host dwelling, to the detriment of its individual character and appearance.
11. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the proposed development would be to diminish unacceptably the character, appearance and integrity of the host building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The appeal scheme would thereby run contrary to the objectives of Policies D2 and D5 of the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking Plan, 2017, which seek to ensure development does not harm local character and distinctiveness and that extensions complement and enhance the host building.
12. I have noted the appellants' desire to increase the size of accommodation to suit their family's needs and that the local Town Council do not object. However, this does not alter my decision.

## **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*H Porter*

INSPECTOR