
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/20/3250416

5 Holly Close, Alveston BS35 3PW

- 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 C. Hill against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/19372/F, dated 20 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey extension to form additional living accommodation at 5 Holly Close, Alveston BS35 3PW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P19/19372/F, dated 20 December 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: Drawing Numbers 1911.1, 1911.2a, 1911.3, 1911.4b, 1911.5a and 1911.6b
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The proposal would be development in the Green Belt. The Council raise no objection on the basis of the proposal being inappropriate development and, based on what I have seen, I find no reason to disagree with this stance. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a detached property, set at the end of a cul-de-sac. It has a relatively low profile to the front elevation, with ground levels dropping resulting in a two-storey rear elevation. To the front elevation, a flat roof integral garage is present, with an elongated pitched roof plane over the main body of the house. The Council highlight that the property represents an example of mid-century architecture. Despite its location at the termination

point of the road, the dwelling is not markedly prominent, particularly given that it sits at a lower level than the road itself.

4. The proposed extension would be positioned to the front elevation and necessitate the removal of the integral garage, relocation of the front door and removal of a small area of flat roof over a window. Whilst it would protrude from the front elevation, given the set back from the estate road, the extension would not appear overly dominant and would not jar with the existing form of the building. Neither, given the set down from the ridgeline and set in from the edges of the front elevation, would it be out of scale or proportion with the existing property.
5. Whilst the flat roof elements to the front elevation would be removed and replaced with the extension, the elongated roof plane would be maintained and remain appreciable. In addition, the roof of the proposed extension, which is multi-faced, would itself create interest and would be read as an appropriate addition to the property. Thus, it would in my view, positively contribute to rather than diminish its character. Neither therefore would it appear as a negative element within the streetscene or the area. I note that the Council contend that the proposal would not respect the building line. However, I observed buildings set back behind the frontage of others; there is consequently variation in the proximity of buildings to the road and no well-defined building line that the proposal would harmfully disrupt.
6. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, the scheme would accord with policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) and policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy (2013). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that residential extensions respect scale and proportions as well as that the form and massing of developments respect the character of the site and its context.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of clarity, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR