



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2021

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3264740

3 Four Acres, Bishopsworth, Bristol BS13 8NQ

- 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 Hannah Gilroy against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03928/H, dated 27/08/2020, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side extension. Extend roof canopy over front door/window on front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side extension. Extend roof canopy over front door/window on front elevation at 3 Four Acres, Bishopsworth, Bristol BS13 8NQ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/03928/H, dated 27/08/2020 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: 3/FA/B/00/P, 3/FA/B/02/P, 3/FA/B/03/P, 3/FA/B/04/P and 3/FA/B/06/P.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Four Acres and the surrounding roads is a residential area with a suburban character where the properties are primarily set back from the roads. Close to the appeal site the dwellings are 2 storey and mostly set in semi-detached pairs or short terraces. The appeal site, along with number 1 form a semi-detached pair. The detailed design differs from the other nearby properties to the sides and opposite. There remains a good degree of uniformity and symmetry between the pair. However, some alterations and additions, such as a side extension at number 1 and a larger porch at the appeal site, have been introduced, reducing the symmetry.

4. I noted there were fairly large front porches at number 5, immediately adjoining the appeal site, and number 6, directly opposite. Other examples of front projecting single storey extensions can also be seen nearby the appeal site. I also observed that there is a wraparound side and rear extension at 97 Highridge Road. This extends close to the boundary with Four Acres. Any pre-existing building line formed by this property along with 1 and 3 Four Acres has been eroded at ground floor level.
5. The front projecting part of the proposed extension would match the depth of the existing porch. The roof pitch would be appropriate for a side and front addition to this style of property, and similar to roof pitches of the single storey additions in the area. The canopy and front projection of the extension would result in some differentiation between the appearance of the two attached properties. However, this already exists to a degree and, given the variety of styles and detailing of the dwellings in the immediately adjoining area, this would not result in any harm to the host property or the street scene. The front of the extension would also not sit forward of the new ground floor side wall at number 97.
6. Front extensions and porches are addressed in the Council's Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document October 2005 (the SPD). It notes that small additions, such as porches, to the fronts of dwellings may be permissible. Given the context of the site, the front projecting part of the extension would be in keeping with the style of the neighbouring properties. I also note that the proposal is not comparable to the unacceptable example given in this document. The SPD also seeks side extensions to be subservient to the existing house and retain its architectural integrity. In view of the single storey nature and modest scale of the proposal, the scheme would be compliant with this aim.
7. It appears that some of the extensions in the locality may not benefit from planning permission. However, there is no evidence that this is so widespread that it would undermine the conclusions above.
8. The development would not harm the character or appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy adopted June 2011 and Policies DM26 and DM27 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted July 2014. Together, these Policies seek to ensure that new development contributes positively to an area's character and identity.

Conditions

9. I have attached a condition specifying the submitted plans to provide certainty and a condition to deal with materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR