The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2019

by R Lankshear BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/19/3236616
17 The Square, Alveston, South Gloucestershire BS35 3PE

- 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 Mrs Linda James against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
- The application Ref P19/6468/F, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2019.
- The development proposed is described as 'two storey & single storey rear extensions, raise roof height & with rear dormers. Demolish existing single storey side extension. (Resubmission of app. PT18/5241/F)'

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing side extension and realignment of boundary fence. Alterations to roofline, erection of single and two storey rear extensions. Creation of new vehicular parking area and alterations to roadside boundary wall at 17 The Square, Alveston, South Gloucestershire BS35 3PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P19/6468/F, dated 30 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0827/1 Existing Survey; 0827/2 Existing Survey; 0827/3A Proposed Elevations; 0827/4A Proposed Ground Floor Plan; 0827/5A Proposed First Floor Plan; 827/8 Existing Block Plan; 0827/9A Proposed Block Plan.

    3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interests of precision and accuracy, I have amended the description of development in the decision above. This has been amended to reflect that on the Council's decision notice as this more accurately describes the appeal development, although omitting reference to 'resubmission of PT18/5241/F' as this is not relevant to the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The site falls within the Green Belt. Accordingly, the main issues are:

   • Whether or not the proposal is inappropriate development within the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework and development plan policy;

   • The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached dwelling situated centrally within the village of Alveston, within a predominantly residential area with variety in terms of the houses and their design. The property is of a traditional design and sits on a corner location allowing clear views of the rear of the property from the road.

5. The appeal proposal seeks to remodel the house including the raising of the eaves and ridge height and alterations to the rear of the property including a part single storey part two storey rear extension.

Whether Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt

6. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states in paragraph 145 that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt subject to a number of exceptions. This includes criterion c) that allows for the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

7. Although the Framework does not define what constitutes a disproportionate addition, policy PSP7 of the adopted South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan 2017 (PSP) states that 'additions resulting in a volume increase of 50% or more of the original building would most likely be considered a disproportionate addition and be refused as inappropriate development.' There is disagreement between the parties with regard to the percentage increase resulting from the development, with the Council stating the works would represent a 54% increase in volume.

8. The proposal would result in a limited increase in the footprint of the property and much of the volume created would be from the reprofiling of the rear projection to facilitate increased headroom at first floor level. The wording of Policy PSP7, in my mind requires each case to be assessed on a matter of fact and degree. In this regard and having considered the nature and extent of the works on its individual merits, even if the development would result in a volume increase of slightly more than 50% as indicated by the Council, I believe that the development would not appear out of scale or proportion to the existing building. As such, in this particular case, I consider the proposal would not amount to a disproportionate addition for the purposes of policy PSP7.

9. For this reason, therefore, I conclude the appeal proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, in this regard, it would accord with the provisions of CS policy CS34 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 (CS), policy PSP7 of the PSP and the Framework.

Character and appearance

10. The development proposed would undoubtedly change the appearance of the dwelling introducing a dual pitch design when viewed from the lane to the site and increasing the eaves and ridge height from the front. Whilst I acknowledge that the development would be visible, owing to the variety of house and roof styles in the locality this would not in itself be unacceptable. As such, I consider that the appeal proposal would not appear out of place or incongruous in the street scene, nor would it appear excessive when viewed against the original dwelling.

11. I conclude that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and consequently it would accord with Policy CS1 of the CS and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the PSP that seek amongst other things that residential extensions should respect the form, scale and architectural detailing of the street, and distinctiveness of the area; and the Framework including the design aims of Chapter 12.

Conditions

12. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.

13. A condition is also imposed requiring materials to match those of the existing dwelling in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

14. I conclude that the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or area.

15. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Robert Lankshear

INSPECTOR