



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2021 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/20/3262605

7A Gadshill Drive, Stoke Gifford BS34 8UU

- 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 Russ Pickford against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P20/14415/F, dated 7 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of first floor side extension to provide additional living accommodation
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the development upon the following:
 - the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, semi-detached pair and area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Tyrrel Way, having particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. Gadshill Drive is part of a wider modern housing estate and suburban area located to the north of Bristol. The estate is mostly characterised by pitched roofed two storey semi-detached or detached properties of similar and coherent scale and design, finished in brick and/or render and set back from the highway with off road parking. The appeal property sits prominently on the corner of the road on the junction with Tyrrel Way following a building line which reflects the curve of the road at this point.
5. The existing semi-detached appeal property and its attached neighbour have a general sense of symmetry and balance, despite differences in the single storey

side projection roof and that of the front porches, in addition to the window and door materials.

6. The introduction of a highly visible gable feature would appear incongruous and at odds with the pitched roof of the semi-detached unit and the generally consistent surrounding roofs. Moreover, whilst not extending the existing footprint of the property, the extension would, by virtue of its height and projection forward of the existing 2 storey front elevation, appear as a prominent and dominating feature which would fail to respect the form or scale of the existing dwelling. The front projecting gable would dominate not only the front elevation of the dwelling but also its semi-detached neighbour. It would have a detrimental impact on the symmetry of the semi-detached pair, unbalancing them at first floor and roof level and subsequently negatively impacting the appearance and character of the street scene.
7. It is acknowledged that there are some examples of gables within the wider area, however these appear to be mostly on detached properties where there is no similar unbalancing impact. The appellant points to a similar gable extension at No 2 Tyrrel Way and No 19 Gadshill Drive, which are semi-detached dwellings, however, no approved drawings or details are provided and as such it is not possible to make a direct comparison, which limits the weight which I can attach to these cases in my recommendation. In addition, they are sited immediately adjacent to neighbouring gable features which limits their visual impact. Similarly, no details are provided of No 1 Tyrrel Way which is also referenced by the appellant. I saw on site that No 1 Tyrrel Way does not include a gable feature and is also not comparable therefore in this respect.
8. In light of the foregoing, it is concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, semi-detached pair and area. There is therefore conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (PSP), which require development to reach a high standard of design which does not adversely affect the character of the locality, in addition to ensuring that extensions do not harm the balance and proportions of the original building and street scene. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires at paragraph 127 that developments, amongst other matters, are sympathetic to local character and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Effect on Living Conditions

9. The extension would be sited close to the boundary with No 21 Tyrrel Way. Given the set back of the appeal property compared to this neighbour, the side elevation of the appeal property extends to the rear of this neighbour. The rear garden area of No 21 is therefore partly enclosed by the appeal property at present, however this is limited by the single storey nature of the projection next to the boundary.
10. The proposed extension would extend the two storey form closer to the boundary. It would be located to the east of No 21 and would not project in depth beyond the existing 2 storey part of the building. Given the orientation of the properties and the limited additional width of the extension, the proposal would be unlikely to affect the amount of light received by the rear rooms and

rear garden of No 21 to a degree that would be harmful to its occupiers' living conditions.

11. However, given its proximity and projection past the rear elevation of No 21, the extension would result in a substantial 2 storey wall facing the rear garden of No 21. It would have an unacceptable overbearing and intrusive impact on the existing outlook from the rear garden area and rear facing windows of No 21. This would lead to an increased and significant sense of enclosure and be likely to make the garden and rooms served by these windows less pleasant to use as a result.
12. It is noted that the planning application did not receive any objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, this is a neutral factor which does not alter my conclusions on this issue.
13. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 21 Tyrrel Way. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with PSP Policies PSP8 and PSP38 which seek to prevent unacceptable harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. These policies are in broad accordance with the Framework.

Recommendation

14. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of No 21 Tyrrel Way and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

B Phillips

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 dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR