

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 December 2020

by Mr Martin Allen B.Sc (Hons), M.Sc, M.R.T.P.I

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/20/3258709

7 Stockwell Close, Downend, Bristol, BS16 6XB

- 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 Harpreet Sehmbi against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/17990/F, dated 30 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side and front extension to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The front, two-storey extension, whilst set down from the main ridge, would introduce an overly dominant and strident, forward-projecting gable. This would be at odds with the existing form of the property and the nearby, similarly designed properties, in the context of which the appeal property is viewed. Therefore, this element would be an unusual and discordant addition to the streetscene, which would be visually harmful to both the host property and the area.
4. The two-storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation and have a ridge below that of the existing property. As such, notwithstanding that the width exceeds half the width of the original property, it would have elements of subservience, would not dominate the house and would be viewed as an appropriate addition.
5. Accordingly, whilst the side extension would not be unacceptable, the front extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, as well as the area, in conflict with policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan - Core Strategy (2013) and policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan – policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017), insofar as they seek to ensure the highest standard of design and that extensions respect the form of the street and surrounding area.

Other Matters

6. I note that the host property has been extended previously, however this does not substantially degrade the similarity shared with the neighbouring properties. There are also differently designed dwellings nearby, thereby introducing variety into the streetscene, but these share little affinity with existing properties and do not share a close relationship, visually, with nearby dwellings. As such, these matters do little to dissuade me of my finding of harm.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr Martin Allen

INSPECTOR

