



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 14 September 2021

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3278360

7 Fairford Road, Shirehampton, Bristol BS11 9QZ

- 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 Mariusz Krol against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/05965/H, dated 10 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was altered during the course of the application and is quoted in the Council's decision notice. The appellant confirmed that they were content with the altered description. This is the description of development I have used.
3. On 20 July 2021, the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The revised Framework does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the main issues raised in this appeal and therefore no parties have been prejudiced by my consideration of it.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal building is one half of a pair of semi detached, two storey dwellings which are typical of this side of Fairford Road. Opposite the appeal site is a short terrace. There is a spacious feel to the street scene which contributes positively to its character and appearance. Although some buildings have been altered, gaps remain between the pairs, which helps reinforce the spaciousness of the area.
6. The proposed development would introduce a two-storey extension, effectively extending to the boundary of the appeal site, into one of the characteristic gaps between two pairs of semis. This would noticeably reduce the spacious feel to the area, upsetting its pleasant rhythm and balance. It would

accordingly result in a cramped appearance to the street scene and thus be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

7. With the above in mind, the proposal would be contrary to Core Strategy¹ (2011) Policy BCS21 and Local Plan² Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30, and the guidance contained within A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2005), which seek, amongst other things, development that contributes positively to an area's character and identity and respects the pattern and grain of development. The appeal scheme would also be contrary to paragraph 130 of the Framework that seeks good design sympathetic to the local character.

Other Matters

8. The extension would be flush with the front elevation at ground floor, would appear subservient to the host dwelling due to its set down from the ridge, and set back at first floor. The use of matching materials would be positive. That said, these elements would not be sufficient to lessen the harm I have found in regards to the main issue.
9. I viewed some similar extensions during my site visit, including No 15 Fairford Road and No 27 Chelwood Road. These were on corner plots or neighbouring corner plots which allowed a larger gap to be retained. In any event the circumstance of each example is likely to be different and would not lead me to allowing the appeal.
10. Should the Council be in an undersupply situation in regard to new housing, this would not be determinative in a proposal for the extension of an existing one. In addition, any concerns the appellant has with the processing of the planning application on the Council's part should be directed to them as an administrative matter. It does not have any bearing on my assessment of the scheme's planning merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR

¹ Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (June 2011)

² Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (July 2014)