



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by K Taylor BSC (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3238702

11 Reedley Road, Stoke Bishop, Bristol, BS9 3SR

- 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 Ingram against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01508/H, dated 26 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey and single storey rear extension and single storey front and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey and single storey rear extension and single storey front and side extensions at 11 Reedley Road, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 3SR, in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: APO1, APO3 Rev A.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building and shall be retained as such thereafter.

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.

Application for Costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Ingram against Bristol City Council. That application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

4. The approved plans include APO3 Revision A, which was submitted with the appeal but not included with the original application. This drawing corrects the position of the single storey side extension in both first floor and roof form, so that it corresponds with the ground floor drawing. I have considered the revised drawing under the principles established by the Courts in Wheatcroft.

As the drawing simply rectifies an error in the original drawing (which the Council highlight in their report), and that drawing was not wholly defective, I am satisfied that by considering it, I would not deprive those who should have been consulted upon it the opportunity of such consultation. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the information submitted with the application and the revised drawing.

5. The plans indicate that a new pedestrian gated access would be created to the side of the property from Briarwood. Although the Council refer to the gate within their report, I am mindful that it does not form part of the description of development and is not shown in elevation at all within the application documents. Consequently, the provision of the pedestrian gate does not form part of the appeal proposal.
6. The proposal involves the erection of a part two-storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey front and side extensions. The Council do not object to the rear and front extensions, and having considered these elements, I concur. The only point of contention therefore is the single storey side extension.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in this matter is the effect of the single storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. The appeal site comprises a two storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the junction of Reedley Road and Briarwood. The site slopes up from the front with the properties on Briarwood behind sitting higher than the appeal dwelling. There is a mix of house types and sizes in the immediate area, which contribute to an interesting street scene.
9. The side elevation of the appeal property sits in line with the front elevation of the property at 28 Briarwood (No 28). The side garden contributes to a sense of spaciousness and a verdant character at the junction of the two roads. Although the side extension would project beyond the front elevation of No 28, due to its single storey form, modest scale and height, the topography of the area and the distance between the two properties, it would not appear incongruous or unduly prominent. Further, there would remain a, not insignificant, gap between the side elevation of the extension and the boundary of the site. This would ensure that the spacious and verdant appearance of the junction is retained. It is also noteworthy that there is a section of grass verge at the back edge of the pavement along Briarwood to the side of the appeal property, which reinforces this appearance.
10. I also observed that on the opposite corner of the junction, the side elevation of No 13 Reedley Road (No13) sits forward of the front elevation of No 1 Briarwood (No 1). The single storey garage building to the rear of No 13 also sits forward of No 1. While I do not have the details of any works that may have been undertaken at No 13 before me, it nevertheless forms part of the wider context and street scene. Further, while the garage may not be highly visible from Reedley Road, it is clearly evident from Briarwood. Within this context, the projection of the proposed single storey extension beyond the

existing building line with No 28 would not appear incongruous or unduly prominent, and no harm would result.

11. In conclusion, the proposed single storey side extension would not result in any unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (June 2011), Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (July 2014) and Supplementary Planning Document Number 2, A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (October 2005). Collectively, these seek among other things, to ensure that development in Bristol contributes positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness, that it responds appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings, building lines and set-backs from the street, skylines and roofscapes, that the layout, form, pattern and arrangement of streets, open spaces, development blocks, buildings and landscape should contribute to the creation of high quality urban design and healthy, safe and sustainable places and that alterations and extensions to existing buildings should respect the siting, scale, form, proportions, materials, details and the overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.

Conditions and Recommendation

12. The Council have suggested a condition that they would wish to see imposed should the appeal be allowed. This would ensure that the materials used in the external surfaces of the proposal match those of the existing dwelling. Given the location of the appeal site and the visibility of all the proposed extensions, such a condition is deemed necessary and reasonable, and would ensure that the proposal would be visually assimilated successfully into its surroundings. A condition to identify the approved plans would also be necessary for clarity.
13. The appellants suggest that they would be agreeable to a condition to retain or enhance the existing boundary hedge to Reedley Road and Briarwood. However, I do not consider that this is necessary. Both the plans and the application form indicate that the hedge is to be retained. Further, the property at No 13 has a significant wall running along its Briarwood elevation and as such there is no consistent boundary treatment at the junction.
14. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission be granted.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR