



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2021

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3275835

1 Maidenhead Road, Hartcliffe, Bristol BS13 0PS

- 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 N Proud against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01554/H, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Decision Notice referred to policies within the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and in the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (LP). Three LP Policies were cited in the Decision Notice, namely DM26, DM27 and DM31, albeit the Officer Report refers to LP Policy DM30 rather than DM31. LP Policy DM31 is concerned with heritage assets, and the Council have confirmed that this policy is not relevant to the appeal, but that LP Policy DM30 is. I have considered the appeal on that basis.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy in my decision, planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, given the particulars of the case I am satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further comment from the parties on the revised Framework, and that in taking such an approach no party or their cases would be prejudiced.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. 1 Maidenhead Road (No 1) is an end-of-terrace house positioned upon a hillside within a residential estate that mostly comprises houses of similar ages and styles. There are a mix of terraced and semi-detached houses within the

estate, with repeated styles and palettes of materials being a dominant characteristic. In addition, the positioning of the houses behind similar sized and regular shaped front gardens creates strong and defined building lines that frame the roads. Taken as a whole the estate has a distinctive, planned appearance with a harmonious, visual cohesion.

6. Lampton Avenue is one of the primary access roads through the estate, with other roads connecting onto it in a broadly perpendicular positional arrangement. No 1 occupies one such corner plot to the southern side of the junction of Maidenhead Road with Lampton Avenue. The breadth of the side garden of this property is similar to that of the sizes of the other side and front gardens further up the hill. The overall effect is one whereby this set back of the houses creates a deliberately spacious appearance to the street scene, with sweeping building lines to either side of the road. This enhances the importance of the road within the estate as it has a deliberate legibility as a primary estate distributor road. Given this, the side and rear garden of No 1 makes a positive contribution to cohesion of the estate.
7. Along the southern side of Maidenhead Road there are several terraced rows of two storey houses with mansard hipped roofs. The proposed extension would be constructed of materials to match the host building, with a mansard roof and a front elevation that would be set back from that of the existing house. These elements of the proposal would accord with the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 – A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005) (SPD), which requires amongst other things extensions to have a subservience and respect to the host building.
8. Despite this, the provision of a two storey side extension would harmfully erode the spacious setting of Lampton Avenue. Although the extension would be set back from this road, having regard to the long views available along Lampton Avenue, it would be visible for some distance. No 1 is at the beginning of the long line of houses with similar sized set backs from the road that combine to create a frame for the southern side of Lampton Avenue. The extension would abruptly truncate this spacious setting, and the position, height and size of the extension would be such that it would be a discordant feature within the street scene.
9. Opposite No 1 is 16 Lampton Avenue (No 16), and this house is at one end of a terraced row that is closer to the public highway than the flank wall of the appeal property. However, No 1 is on the opposite side of Maidenhead Road, separated from No 16 by both the road and the rising topography. Furthermore, the curvature of Lampton Avenue means that No 1 is seen within the context of the long sweep of houses that are beyond it higher up the slope, and as it is the first property with a generous garden its prominence is enhanced. Given this relationship, the extension would unacceptably erode the character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other houses with side extensions, and also to gardens enclosed by tall fences, walls and hedges. I saw at my site visit that opposite the appeal property there are high timber garden fences and walls, whilst 27 Lampton Avenue has a side extension. However, this extension is single storey and neither projects beyond the existing front wall of the house nor beyond the building line that frames this side of Lampton Avenue. As such it neither erodes the qualities of the area nor is it unduly

prominent. Moreover, despite the height of nearby fences and walls they have a clear legibility as a boundary treatment, and above them the spacious setting of the road is maintained. As such these instances do not predetermine my decision.

11. Finally, the appellant considers the extension would be a better use of land and provide a larger family home. These would be benefits of the proposal, but neither would outweigh the significant harm I have found.
12. The extension would, therefore, unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to CS Policy BCS21, LP Policies DM26, DM27, and DM30, and the supporting guidance in the SPD. These seek amongst other things, high quality development that respects and reinforces local distinctiveness, thereby reflecting objectives of the Framework. In addition, they also require that extensions have physical and visual subservience to the host building and the area. For the reasons given above the extension would fail to accord with these policies.

Conclusion

13. Thus, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan when considered as a whole and the benefits of the extension would not outweigh the harm I have found. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR