
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3253432

28 Hulse Road, Brislington, Bristol BS4 5AL

- 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 Darren Horne against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01094/H, dated 8 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side extension in place of the existing garage, to provide an additional bedroom with ensuite and playroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two storey side extension in place of the existing garage, to provide an additional bedroom with ensuite and playroom at 28 Hulse Road, Brislington, Bristol BS4 5AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01094/H, dated 8 March 2020, 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: 1:1250 scale location plan, 1:200 scale block plan, Drawing Numbers Z-596-D001, Z-596-D002, Z-596-D003, Z-596-D004, Z-596-D005, Z-596-D006 and Z-596-D007

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace property, located along a residential street. The property is two-storey in height with an attached lean-to garage. The immediate vicinity is characterised by terraces of properties, whilst there are semi-detached buildings in the wider area. I noted that some properties had additions to the side, these were generally single storey.
4. The scheme proposes a two-storey addition to the side, which whilst not setback from the front elevation and having the same eaves height as the existing, would nonetheless have a height stepped down from the ridge height of the dwelling and front roof plane set back from that of the existing, as well as a relatively narrow width. In my view, this would result in the addition being

viewed as a subservient addition to the existing dwelling. Given this subservience, as well as the use of matching materials, I find that the extension would not be an incongruous feature of the terrace, but rather would be an appropriate addition to it. It follows that it would harmonise with the terrace and would not be injurious to the streetscene. My view in this regard is reinforced by the Council highlighting that no existing extensions to end of terrace dwellings in the area appear seamlessly as part of the original terrace.

5. There would be a ground floor and first floor window to the front elevation, which whilst not replicating the size of existing windows, would be centrally positioned. Given that the extension would be read as an addition to the dwelling, the departure in window styles as proposed would not be unduly harmful or warrant dismissal of the appeal.
6. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Thus, it accords with policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development reinforces and contributes to local distinctiveness, as well as that development respects the design and character of the host building and the streetscene.
7. I acknowledge that the proposal would not follow the ridge height of the remainder of the terrace, as advised for side extensions to terraced properties, in the Councils Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 – A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005). Neither would it be set back from the front elevation. However, given that the extension would have a subservient appearance and would not be a discordant feature in the streetscene, I find good reason for departing from this general advice in this instance.

Other Matters

8. I note that the Council raise concern over the proposal setting a precedent for future development. However, given that I have found the scheme to be acceptable, no precedent would be established for undesirable development.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of clarity, to define the plans with which the development should accord.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR