



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3271520

1 Ellbridge Close, Sea Mills, Bristol BS9 1BU

- 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 Joe & Lucy Erskine against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/05808/H, dated 2 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey side /rear and front extension with raised terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey side /rear and front extension with raised terrace at 1 Ellbridge Close, Sea Mills, Bristol BS9 1BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/05808/H dated 2 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2016_1EC_X002, 2016_1EC_D100, 2016_1EC_D101, 2016_1EC_D101, 2016_1EC_D103, 2016_1EC_D104 (all plans received 3/2/21).
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) The privacy screen shown on the approved plans shall be installed prior to the first use of the terrace hereby approved and retained at all times thereafter.

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 Matter

3. Amended plans were submitted during the consideration of the application, reducing the side extension from two storey to single. These amended plans were fully considered by the Council and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of these plans. This reflected in the above description of

development, which is taken from Part E of the appeal form and the Council's decision notice.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and on the living conditions of the occupants of No 2 Ellbridge Close, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons for Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property is sited on the corner of Ellbridge Close and Lyndale Avenue. Ellbridge Close is a short cul de sac running off the longer Lyndale Road, which rises from the north west end. Both are suburban residential roads, mostly characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind gardens and parking areas, with a consistent building line and largely open corner plots such as the appeal site, contributing to the area's open, spacious character.
6. The proposed side extension would be limited in width but would project forward of the consistent Lyndale Avenue building line. However, given its single storey nature, even with the land dropping to its rear and viewed from the corner of Lyndale Avenue and Sea Mills Lane, the visual impact above the existing boundary fencing would be limited, and it would be clearly seen as a subservient addition to the main house. Moreover, given the distance to the nearest dwellings along Lyndale Avenue, the impact of the single storey extension on the building line would not be obvious or significant, and it would not harm the established open character of the surroundings.
7. Each proposal should be considered on its own merits and the characteristics of that site. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would set an unwelcome precedent. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding the proposed rear terrace or front porch extension with regards to impact upon character and appearance. From everything which I have seen on the site visit and in submissions, I have no reason to disagree.
8. Therefore, the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There is no conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy 2011 (CS), Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 (LP) which collectively require development to be of high quality and respond appropriately to building lines and local pattern of development. Furthermore, there is no conflict with the advice set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (2005) (SPD) which requires extensions to generally respect the built form, scale and proportions of the house and the characteristics of the wider area.

Effect on living conditions

9. The rear element of the proposed extension would match the depth of the neighbouring extension at No 2, which is sited on the boundary, and the proposed raised terrace would further 2.84m to the rear.

10. Given its siting, the proposed privacy screen would be in close proximity to the rear extension, patio area and garden of No 2. The land falls to the rear of the site so in relative terms the screen would be higher when seen from the patio and garden of No 2 than from the proposed terrace. However, due to its limited depth, the screen would not be overbearing to an extent that have an adverse effect upon the current pleasant outlook from these areas. It would not be likely to make the room served by the rear extension, the rear garden or patio area significantly less pleasant to use as a result.
11. Given the orientation of the properties, the privacy screen would only shade part of No 2 in the late afternoon and would therefore be unlikely to reduce light reaching that property to a degree that it would be harmful to its occupiers' living conditions.
12. Therefore, the proposed development would not significantly adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 2 Ellbridge Close, and in this regard there would be no conflict with CS Policy BCS21 and DM Policy DM30 or the SPD, which collectively seek to ensure proposals do not prejudice the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested the imposition of a condition relating to the start date of development, and in addition to requiring compliance with the application plans, I consider these to be appropriate in the interest of clarity. In addition, I agree that a condition requiring materials to match the existing original property is also necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the locality.
14. Finally, a condition requiring the erection and retention of the privacy screen is considered necessary, in order to prevent direct overlooking of the adjoining neighbour.

Conclusion

15. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed with the suggested conditions.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed with the conditions set out above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR