The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3241192
6 Greenlands Way, Henbury, Bristol BS10 7PR

- 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 Ben Willshire against the decision of Bristol City Council.
- The application Ref 19/02133/H, dated 3 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
- The development proposed is 2 storey side & single storey rear extension (demolish existing garage & rear conservatory).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side and single storey rear extension (demolish existing garage and conservatory) at 6 Greenlands Way, Henbury, Bristol, BS10 7PR, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/02133/H, dated 3 May 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, BR 02, BR 04a, BR 07a, BR 08a, BR 09a, BR 10a, BR11a.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The garage referred to in the description of development has been demolished and I have assessed the appeal on this basis. However, for completeness, I have retained the wording used by both parties to describe the appeal proposal.

4. The Council's decision notice contains two separate refusal reasons. However, the second is clearly an error as it is titled 'List of approved plans and drawings'. I note that the appellant concurs with this conclusion and so I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The Council do not object to the proposed single storey rear extension. Having considered this matter, I find no reason to reach a different conclusion.

6. The main issue in this matter therefore is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property, semi-detached pair and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property on the south side of Greenlands Way. The property sits within a trapezoidal shaped plot and benefits from a rear conservatory. The proposal is for the demolition of the conservatory and garage (the latter has already been removed) and the erection of a single storey rear extension and two storey side extension. The first floor of the two storey extension will be cantilevered above a side access way.

8. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling, in the region of 850mm, have matching eaves height and its ridge would be set down from the main ridge. The distance of set-back from the front elevation would be less than advised by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Number 2, A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (October 2005) (SPD2), which requires a minimum of 1m. However, in conjunction with the lower ridge height, form, scale, mass and overall design, the proposed set back would be sufficient to ensure that the proposed extension achieves an acceptable level of subservience to the host dwelling, would respect its proportions and would not appear over dominant.

9. Moreover, the proposed two-storey side extension, due to its form, scale, mass and overall design would respect the proportions and character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of dwellings. It is also noteworthy that the attached property includes a flat roofed two storey side extension, which although set back from the front elevation projects beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling. While I do not have details of that extension before me, it nevertheless forms part of the wider context of this proposal.

10. The layout of the dwellings along this section of Greenlands Way, which is on a slight curve, means that the boundary between the appeal site and its neighbour at No 7 is tapered. The proposed side extension would be sited so that its front elevation would be closer to the boundary than the rear. I observed that the property at No 7 currently benefits from a single storey car port. Consequently, while the gap at ground floor would be reduced, it would not be closed and a sufficient gap would be retained at first floor level between the properties to ensure that no terracing effect would occur and the proposal would not appear cramped.

11. The Council are also concerned that a terracing effect may occur should the neighbouring property construct a similar extension. While I have assessed the proposal before me on its merits, I am satisfied that given the orientation of the properties to each other and the tapered nature of the boundary, the gap between the properties would be unlikely to be completely closed, even if it were to be reduced. In association with the design of the proposal before me there would therefore be no significant terracing effect. The appeal proposal

would reflect existing development in the area, where a number of two storey extensions have been erected which extend up, or close, to side boundaries. In such cases, these have significantly reduced the gap between properties or removed them altogether. While the Council indicate that these examples are historic and were approved under a different policy regime, they nevertheless form part of the wider context for this proposal and are part of the prevailing character of the area.

12. Moreover, there is no evidence before me that the occupants of No 7 are proposing a similar extension. Consequently, based upon the evidence before me and considering the appeal proposal on its merits, I do not consider that the potential for a harmful terracing effect to occur is substantiated.

13. The proposed two storey extension would feature both render and cedar cladding. I note the Council accept that the proposed materials would not of themselves have justified the refusal of the application in their own right but do ascribe some minor resultant harm. There are various materials used on properties within Greenlands Way and the surrounding area. These include both timber cladding and render. Within this context the proposed materials are acceptable and would respect the character and appearance of the streetscene and surrounding area.

14. In conclusion, the proposal is acceptable and complies with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011), Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (Adopted July 2014) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, among other things, to ensure that development contributes positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness and responds appropriately to the height, scale, massing shape, form and proportion of existing buildings, building lines and set-backs from the streets, skylines and rooflines. More specifically, extensions and alterations to 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. The proposal also complies with the aspirations of SPD2 in ensuring that extensions respect the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Conditions and Recommendation

15. The Council have suggested a number of conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. A condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition is also suggested that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building. The drawings and application form indicate that the proposal is to employ brickwork, render and red cedar cladding which are not all materials used in the existing building. Given the mix of materials found upon properties in the area, I have concluded that these are acceptable. They are identified on the approved plans and therefore it is not necessary to attach such a condition.

16. 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

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR