
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

by John Wilde CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/20/3257709

92 Long Road, Mangotsfield, Bristol BS16 9HP

- 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 Dane Sampson against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P20/02371/F, dated 6 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of part of existing dwelling. Erection of 1 No dwelling (use class C3) with car parking, cycle storage, private amenity space, refuse storage and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached property finished in render with a pitched roof. Other properties in Long Road are generally terraced or semi-detached, some finished in render and some in brick. A common feature is that nearly all the adjacent properties have the first floor windows situated directly below the eaves. All sit behind short front gardens and some, not including the appeal property, have bay windows. There is a single storey extension to the side of the appeal building that would be demolished to make way for the proposed attached new dwelling.
4. Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy adopted December 2013 (CS) requires, amongst other things, that development achieves the highest possible standards of design and site planning. It also requires that the scale, form, height, massing, detailing, colours and materials are informed by, respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of both the site and its context.
5. The proposed dwelling would have a slightly lower ridge line than the host property and would be slightly set back with the door on the side, appearing as a subservient extension. To my mind this would negate the fact that the new dwelling would be narrower than the existing. However, the front windows

would be wider than on the existing dwelling and the ground floor window would also be deeper. This would be out of keeping with the host property and cannot to my mind be construed as achieving the highest possible standards of design. Conflict with policy CS1 therefore exists.

6. My attention has been drawn to a variety of other permitted extensions within the area. However, I am obliged to assess the proposal before me against the development plan, and in this particular case have found that the proposed extension would not be of the highest possible standard of design.
7. I note the appellant's comments regarding the lack of communication from the Local Planning Authority, but this is not a matter before me in this appeal.

Conclusion

8. In light of my above findings, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR