
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/20/3248276

17 School Road, Frampton Cotterell, Bristol, South Glos. BS36 2DB

- 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 Hilary Brugin against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/18094/F, dated 22 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is front porch and front first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 appeal form indicates that the appellant is Mrs Hilary Burgin. The appellant's name in the banner header above has been taken from the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this matter is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a detached property that appears as a bungalow to the front but which has living accommodation at first floor level. It sits on the north side of School Road, a residential road that includes a mix of bungalows and two storey dwellings. The proposal seeks to add a porch to the front elevation, to replace an existing structure, and a roof extension at first floor.
6. To the front, the appeal property has a steeply sloping roof. The first floor extension would be set just below the ridge and due to its scale, width, design and considerably higher eaves than those of the existing property, would appear as an overly dominant and bulky addition within the roof plane. This would be exacerbated by the amount of glazing to the extension, which would appear uncharacteristic and would amplify its prominence. At ground floor, the

porch would be approximately the third of the width of the dwelling. It would have a hipped roof design, with a small flat roofed section, and would adjoin the front of the proposed first floor extension, creating an awkward visual relationship. Moreover, in conjunction with the first-floor extension, the porch would add to the proposal's overall level of bulk. Consequently, the porch and first floor extension, when taken together, would form a bulky and incongruous addition to the property, which would be harmful to its character and appearance.

7. The host property currently makes a limited contribution to the streetscene, which I acknowledge has a varied appearance. However, due to its design, scale, bulk and prominence, and the resulting harm that would be caused to its character and appearance, the proposal would appear discordant and incongruous within this particular part of the road. The contribution that the host property makes to the character and appearance of the area, albeit limited, would thus be diminished by the proposal.
8. The appellant has referred me to a previous planning permission granted by the Council in 2011 for similar works at the property¹, although I am not aware of the full circumstances or context of its approval. I note that that proposal was considered under a previous policy regime, although the appellant indicates that the current policies are not dissimilar. However, notwithstanding that, the decision on the previous application was made prior to the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework in 2012 (the Framework). The Framework makes it clear that developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. For the above reasons, the proposal would not achieve these aims. In addition, there is no evidence before me to suggest that the works were commenced or that the permission is extant. As such, it appears that the permission lapsed some time ago and is no longer capable of being implemented. Consequently, the previous permission does not amount to a viable fallback position and as such carries limited weight.
9. I also observed the properties referred to by the appellant as being subject to planning applications, although I have not been furnished with the full details of these developments. However, I did observe that at the time of my visit none of these properties have had similar works undertaken to what is being proposed. With regard to the properties at 15 and 21 School Road, the appellant indicates that these works consisted of a replacement dwelling (No 15) and first floor rear and side extensions (No 21), which I do not consider to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal. I also noted that a number of dwellings have had dormers constructed/roof works undertaken. However, these are of a different scale and design to the appeal proposal. I am also mindful that each case must be considered on its merits. Consequently, I afford the presence of these works limited weight in my assessment and do not consider that they justify the unacceptable development proposed.
10. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. There would be conflict with Policies CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy

¹ PT11/0712/F – Information taken from page 1 of the appellant's statement.

2006 – 2027 (adopted December 2013) and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted November 2017) (LPPSPP). These policies require development proposals to demonstrate that their scale is informed by, respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of both the site and its context. Specifically, residential extensions will be acceptable where they respect the form, scale and proportions of the street and surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant notes that in the officer's report it is accepted that the proposal complies with Policy PSP38 of the LPPSPP. She therefore queries why this is a reason for refusal. The officer's report refers to Policy PSP38 under residential amenity and identifies that the proposal does not conflict with the policy in this regard. However, the report also refers to Policy PSP38 under design and visual amenity. While this section of the report does not explicitly conclude against this policy, it is evident from the refusal reason that the Council consider the proposal to conflict with it. I therefore consider that this policy is relevant in my assessment of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR