
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/21/3276933

21 New Fosseway Road, Hengrove, Bristol BS14 9LW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kevin Adams against Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01395/H, is dated 13 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and single storey rear extension at 21 New Fosseway Road, Hengrove, Bristol BS14 9LW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01395/H, dated 13 March 2021, 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: 1:1250 scale location plan and Drawing Number 001 dated Mar.'21

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has provided putative reasons for refusal and it is on these that I have focussed the main issue below.
3. The scheme proposed a single storey rear extension as well as a two-storey side extension. The Council patently has no objection to the rear addition, as such I have addressed only the matter of the two-storey extension in my reasoning below.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) whether the proposal would unduly hinder the development potential of the adjoining site.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property located along New Fosseway Road. While the Council contend that the built form along this road is significantly uniform, I do not agree. The form of semi-detached units extends only part way along this road; a short distance west of the appeal site

dwelling are arranged in short terraces with small gaps separating them. As such, there is some variety in the built form present.

6. The proposal would introduce a new built element alongside the existing property and to an extent it would reduce the separation that currently exists. However, the proposed extension would be set off the boundary by approx. 0.3 metres and would be considerably stepped back behind the front elevation of the host property. Moreover, the roof would be hipped and set down below the highest part of the main roof. These factors result in a development that would retain the appearance of a measure of separation between the host property and that which it neighbours. It would not result in an unacceptable terracing effect or appear cramped; this is particularly so given the variety in building form seen in the wider area.
7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area. Thus, the scheme accords with policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework - Core Strategy (June 2011), as well as policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (July 2014) (the DM Policies Plan). Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development reinforces local distinctiveness, responds appropriately to form of existing buildings, is appropriate to the immediate context and extensions to existing buildings respect the broader streetscene.
8. While there may be technical conflict with the guidance of the Supplementary Planning Document 2 (A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions) for the reasons given above I find good reason for departing from this advice, particularly given the lack of harm that I have identified.

Development of adjoining site

9. The proposed extension would extend to within approximately 0.3 metres of the boundary with the neighbouring property. While the Council contend that this would prejudice the future development potential of the adjoining site, there is nothing before me that convinces me that it would not be possible to erect an addition to the neighbouring property following construction of the appeal scheme. Furthermore, there is nothing that indicates to me that a future extension at the neighbouring property is likely. Thus, I find no conflict with policy DM27 of the DM Policies Plan, insofar as it seeks to ensure that the future development potential of adjoining sites is not prejudiced.

Conditions

10. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed a plans condition to define the approved drawings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR