



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020

by M Scriven BA (Hons) MSc CMgr MCIHT MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3243672

14 Cransley Crescent, Henleaze, Bristol BS9 4PG

- 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 A Phillpotts against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03899/H, dated 9 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development on the application form differs to the plans submitted and subsequent descriptions by both main parties. It is evident from the submitted plans that the proposal is for a first floor side extension, I have determined the appeal on that basis and reflected it in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi detached house located on a road of similar aged and styled properties, some of which appear to have been extended to the side over time, including the adjoining property, No 16. The character and appearance of the area is positively defined by the comparable property styles, set back from the road with clear gaps between property pairings at and above first floor level. These gaps afford views between plots to trees and vegetation in rear gardens in the immediate vicinity as well as in the distance, creating a valuable open appearance rather than a closed terraced form.
5. The development would change the current appearance of the property by widening it across the full width of the adjoining stepped back garage which links to that of No 12. The plans show a proposed roof set below the main property, replicating its hipped roof form but appearing higher than that of No 12. To avoid the proposed eaves overhanging the neighbouring property a parapet wall is shown running much of the length of the new extension.
6. Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions, 2005, (SPD2), details the Council's design guidance

for extensions. This includes that extensions should avoid a terracing effect. The proposed step back from the building line of the main house and garage below would make the development subordinate to the principle house in this regard. Notwithstanding the appellant's view, the existing attached garages do not create a terraced appearance, but rather the space above creates a clear valuable gap. By extending the full width of the garage, the existing space between the two properties at and above first floor level, albeit not filled entirely, would be reduced significantly, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

7. Despite the use of matching materials to the existing house, the development would be different to the prevailing form of the road by virtue of the full garage width side extension and roof arrangement. This would be made more pronounced by the vertical addition of the parapet wall which would be clearly visible from the roadside. Therefore, the extension would appear cramped in the space available further detracting from its surrounds. I have noted the side extension at the adjoining property (no 16). However, it occupies a corner plot and given the prevailing space around the dwelling, the extension does not have a similar effect in terms of filling part of a gap in the same way the appeal scheme would.
8. My attention has also been drawn to a number of other schemes that have been permitted nearby and which the appellant argues justify the current proposal. However, it appears from the available evidence that many of these either pre-date the adoption of the SPD2 or the current Development Plan. Notwithstanding this, I have not been made aware of the detailed circumstances that led to their approval and have determined the appeal on its own merits. Moreover, these examples by no means define the area's prevailing character and appearance.
9. A previous appeal decision (APP/Z0116/A/08/2092334) dated 3 March 2009, has been referred to by the appellant in support of their appeal. The gaps between the properties on this adjoining road (South Croft) appear less visible when travelling along the road as it largely straight whereas this section of Cransley Crescent is curved making the gaps more prominent and defining. Albeit SPD2 referred to in that decision is the same as in this appeal, the Development Plan is not. As such I have given it limited weight in my decision.
10. Further to the above, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Core Strategy 2011, which ensures that development should be of high quality design and contribute positively to the area's character and identity. The development would not accord with Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014, which have broadly similar aims. In addition, the proposal would conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the SPD2.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above the appeal is dismissed.

Matthew Scriven

INSPECTOR