
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2020

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3253116

22 Old Sneed Avenue, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 1SE

- 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 Anton Lavelle against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/05297/H, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to the property on the north (rear), west and south (road) elevations to provide additional residential accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to the property on the north (rear), west and south (road) elevations to provide additional residential accommodation at 22 Old Sneed Avenue, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 1SE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/05297/H, dated 30 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 001, 002, 003, 004, 005 Revision P1, 006, 007, 012, 013 Revision P2, 014 Revision P3, 015 Revision P3 and 016 Revision P4.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. The plans that accompanied the original application have been subject to amendments. The most recent of these formed the basis of the Council's decision, and I have determined the appeal on the same basis, while referring to the relevant drawings in my decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the setting of the Sneyd Park Conservation Area (SPCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site, a detached dwelling, comprises the end property in a sequence of seven traditional dwellings which all incorporate the same original design. Two of the dwellings in the sequence have been extended to their side, yet these additions are subordinate and largely maintain key original features of the dwelling, particularly the main hipped roof, the double height bay windows and a recessed catslide roof. The relative uniformity of the design and scale of these dwellings has a positive influence on the character of the street.
5. The appeal site is located along the northern frontage of Old Sneed Avenue, where dwellings are traditional in terms of their design, largely consistent in terms of their scale and set within spacious plots with landscaped front gardens. The northern frontage is outside but adjacent to the SPCA, which encompasses dwellings on the street's southern frontage. I have therefore attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area (CA) in accordance with section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
6. The proposal comprises an extension, incorporating a storey and a half, emanating from the side and rear of the appeal dwelling. Although it would be sited further forward than the existing side wing, this distance would be marginal, and it would still be set behind the front bay windows and set down from the main roofline exposing the dwelling's original features. In addition to its recessed position, the proposal's scale is proportionate with the main dwelling and would not appear excessive or dominant in relation to it.
7. I note the Council's concern regarding the loss of the original cat slide roof which forms part of the dwelling's recessed side projection. However, the proposal would maintain a similar asymmetrical roof profile that would incorporate a dipping front roof plane, while the low eaves would run parallel with the top of the host property's ground floor bay window, in a similar fashion to the existing catslide roof. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposal would be significantly out of keeping with the design of the original dwelling in this regard. Accordingly, I find no visual harm to the host dwelling.
8. The appeal property is sited between one of the seven dwellings referred to above that has been extended, namely No 24 Old Sneed Avenue (No 24) and No 20, a semi-detached dwelling with a gabled roof facing the street. In this context the proposed development's subordinate relationship relative to the host dwelling would ensure it would not appear obtrusive, while it would generally be in keeping with the proportions and traditional character of dwellings in the street.
9. The properties in the SPCA, on the opposite side of the road, comprise large traditional detached and semi-detached dwellings positioned within generous and landscaped plots. It is considered that this part of the SPCA derives its significance from the historic detailing of the dwellings along with their spacious and verdant surroundings. The proposal has a design, scale and siting that would not fundamentally alter the features that contribute towards the significance of the SPCA and how it is experienced, therefore it would have no adverse effect upon its setting.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area, including the setting of the SPCA. It would therefore accord with Policies BCS22 and BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, adopted June 2011 and Policies DM30 and DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan, adopted July 2014. Collectively, these require, amongst other things, that proposals respect and contribute positively to the character of the dwelling and the area, while preserving the setting of conservation areas. The proposal also accords with the aims of Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 – A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions, October 2005, where it requires extensions to be subservient to the main house. The National Planning Policy Framework's requirements in terms of preserving heritage assets have also been complied with.

Other Matters

11. I have considered the concerns of the neighbouring occupiers of No 24 in respect of natural light and overlooking. However, I agree with the Council's assessment that there would not be a substantial loss of natural light, while the side window referred to would be inserted at an angle into the roof of the proposed extension such that it would not increase overlooking into corresponding windows at No 24. Consequently, the proposed development would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 24, in terms of natural light and privacy.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions, amending or omitting them where necessary for clarity and to ensure compliance with the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework.
13. It is necessary that planning permission is granted subject to conditions that relate to the standard time limit for commencement of development and a schedule of plans that the development relates to. These are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to the construction of the extension in materials to match is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR