
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th January 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3238118

6 Greenacre Road, Whitchurch, Bristol BS14 0HL

- 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 Jayne Britton against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02732/H, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

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 dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detach bungalow located in a residential cul-de-sac that contains a mix of two storey and single storey semi-detached dwellings.
4. Together with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 5 Greenacre Road, the appeal property shares the same building line, eaves and ridge line. When viewed from the street, the mass and scale of each semi-detached bungalow is largely identical. Each front facing elevation has a bay window next to a recessed window with a canopy above that mirror one another. There are differences between the two properties when viewed from the street, however, these are relatively minor and confined to the colour and texture of exterior finishes rather than the overall design.
5. Either side of No 5 and the appeal property are two further pairs of semi-detached dwellings, built in the same style, mass and scale, while also incorporating the same distinctive window features on their respective front elevations. As a trio, their shared appearance and uniformity, has a pleasing rhythm that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the cul-de-sac.
6. The proposed front extension would extend across roughly half of the dwelling's frontage, project approximately 2m from the front building line and have a pitched roof that would break the continuous eaves line the appeal property

shares with No 5. The proposal would also result in the distinctive front recessed window and canopy being lost. Consequently, the extension's siting, and excessive scale and projection would appear jarring. This would have an unacceptably disruptive impact upon the host dwelling and the symmetry it currently enjoys with the adjoining semi-detached property. The harm would also extend to interrupting the uniformly designed frontages in the sequence of semi-detached bungalows the appeal property forms part of. The result of this would have an incongruous impact on the character and appearance of the area.

7. I acknowledged that the appellants have space needs that would be met by the proposed extension. However, these do not outweigh the harm the proposal would incur on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. I therefore attach limited weight to this argument.
8. In support of the appeal my attention has been drawn to a similar front extension that was approved nearby at No 65 Maplestone Road. I do not know the full planning circumstances of this case or the policies that applied at the time of its consideration. In any case, from my site visit observations, the example given appears not to have the same excessive projection as the appeal proposal. Moreover, it is located amongst dwellings that have extended their front facing elevations, in contrast to the more uniform appeal property and the row of dwellings it sits amongst. On this basis it would be difficult to draw similarities between the appeal proposal and the example given.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host dwelling. Therefore, this would be contrary to Policy BCS21 of the Bristol City Council Core Strategy, adopted June 2011 and Policies DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol City Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Document, adopted July 2014. Amongst other matters, these require development proposals to reinforce local character and to respect the overall design and character of the host dwelling and broader street scene. The proposal is also contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document 2: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions, adopted October 2005. This amongst other considerations requires proposals for front extensions to make a positive contribution to improving the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the appeal should be dismissed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR