



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3258201

11 Beloe Road, Bishopston, Bristol BS7 8RB

- 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 Steve Taylor against the decision of Bristol City Council.
- The application Ref 20/02194/H, dated 20 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
- The proposed development is demolition of existing garage and replacement with new double storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and replacement with new double storey side extension at 11 Beloe Road, Bishopston, Bristol BS7 8RB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02194/H, dated 20 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. 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.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location and Block Plan 001, Site Plan and Floor Plans as Existing 002, Elevations as Existing 003, Site plan as Proposed 004A, Proposed Ground Floor Plan 005A, Proposed First Floor Plan 006A, Proposed Roof Plan 007A, Proposed Beloe Road (Front) Elevation 008A, Proposed Garden Elevation 009A and Proposed Side (Beloe Road) Elevation 010A.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the proposed development included within the decision notice is more concise than that which is included within the application form. I have therefore used the former within the banner heading and decision above.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling with a hipped roof form and an attached garage, situated on a large corner plot along Beloe Road. The host building is considerably set back from the eastern boundary of the appeal site. The surrounding area is characterised by terraces of similar two-storey dwellings and a sense of openness between terraces.
6. The proposed two-storey extension would continue the roof line of both the host building and the adjoining terrace and would also feature a hipped roof form, as is characteristic of properties within the surrounding area. It would also be flush with both the host dwelling and the adjoining terrace. The proposal would therefore integrate positively with the host building and the adjoining terrace and appear as a proportionate addition.
7. Furthermore, although the extension would project further beyond the building line of the houses to the rear, it would be significantly set back from the eastern site boundary. It would not appear as an overly dominant addition to the streetscene and so would not cause harm to the spacious quality of this corner. Additionally, I saw during my site visit that a comparable extension was under construction at No 56 Maple Road, a highly visible corner site located around 100m north of the appeal site. Given the proximity of this nearby development, and the similarity of its corner position, the proposal would appear entirely congruous within the street.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would not be set back from the front elevation or down from the ridge. However, "A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions" Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2005) (the SPD) states that for end-of-terrace houses, it is often more suitable to continue the terrace building line and roof ridge height so that the extension becomes part of the terrace. As the host building is clearly an end-of-terrace property, I disagree that the proposal should be assessed in relation to the SPD's guidance for semi-detached properties. The extension's visible position on this open corner and forward of the building line of the houses to the rear does not necessitate the proposal be assessed against the guidance for semi-detached houses, and there is no reason to do this on highway safety grounds either.
9. Like the host dwelling, several properties within the terrace have front porches or bay window-style projections. Nonetheless, the front façade of each of the properties within the terrace are flush with one another, and so the terrace has a clear building line. The proposed canopy would respect this and, due to its hipped form, would respond positively to the proportions of the existing porch and the established character of neighbouring properties. Its greater width would not unacceptably disrupt the rhythm of the terrace.
10. Although integrated garages are not common locally, this aspect does not affect the proposal's positive response to the character and appearance of the host building, adjoining terrace and surrounding area.
11. For the above reasons, the proposal would therefore comply with Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Site

Allocations and Development Management Plan (2014) which state that new development should deliver high quality urban design, be expected to contribute towards local character and distinctiveness, be appropriate to the immediate context and respect the scale, form and proportions of the host building and the broader street scene. The proposal would also comply with the SPD, as set out above.

Conditions

12. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt.
13. To preserve the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, I have also attached a condition requiring that materials used for the proposal must match those of the existing building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR