



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3246747

34 Materman Road, Stockwood, Bristol BS14 8SS

- 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 S Carter against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03951/H, dated 4 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for two storey extension at 34 Materman Road, Stockwood, Bristol BS14 8SS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/03951/H, dated 4 August 2009, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, 2, 5, 6 and 7.
 - 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.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the following:
 - the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupants of No 36 Materman Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. Materman Road is a quiet suburban residential street, made up of traditional two storey dwellings, mostly semi-detached but with some detached dwellings evident, with large apartment complex on the western end of the road. The dwellings are set back from the highway, providing a sense of openness and off-street parking, and there is a variety of design of the dwellings and differing scale of separation distance, if any, between the units.
5. The appeal property is one half of a semi-detached unit, and the proposed extension would broadly match that of the attached neighbour. Whilst the extension would extend up to the boundary and would be flush with the existing frontage and ridge of the dwelling, there are numerous examples of similar projections up to a side boundary evident along the street, for example opposite and next door.
6. I acknowledge that the proposal would result in some conflict with the Supplementary Planning Document 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (2005) (SPD) which recommends a set back and set down for side extensions to semi-detached houses, however the document explains that this is in the interest of the balance of the semi-detached pair and character of the street. Given the extension next door, the proposed extension would balance the semi-detached unit. Moreover, whilst the separation gap between the appeal property and No 36 would be reduced, this would reflect the variety of such gaps evident in the locality. The proposal would not appear incongruous nor out of keeping with the established street scene.
7. As such, it is concluded that the proposal is not harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I see no conflict therefore with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 (CS) or Policies DM26 or DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 (DM), which collectively advocate that new development should deliver high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character and identity and respects the broader street scene. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which sets out that development should be sympathetic to local character and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Living conditions

8. The new extension would be located on the party boundary with No 36 which has a ground floor window and door and first floor window on its side elevation facing towards the appeal property. Although the proposal would take the extended dwelling closer to these windows and door, I am satisfied that sufficient separation would exist between these features such that the new extension would not be overbearing on the outlook from the windows and door of No 36, or result in undue enclosure. The proposal would therefore be unlikely to make the rooms that these features serve less pleasant to use as a result.
9. In light of the foregoing, it is concluded that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 36 Materman

Road in terms of outlook. There is therefore no conflict with CS Policy BCS21 or DM Policies DM30 which, along with the SPD, collectively seek to protect living conditions and the amenity of existing development. Moreover, there is no conflict with paragraph 127 of the Framework which requires that a high standard of amenity for existing and future users is provided.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the start date of development, the matching of the materials used for the proposed extension with those used in the existing house, and compliance with the application plans. In the interest of clarity and to protect the character and appearance of the area, I consider these to be appropriate.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

B Phillips

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, with the suggested conditions.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR