

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 November 2021 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by S R G Baird BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/21/3279392

25 Mangotsfield Road, Mangotsfield, Bristol, BS16 9JJ

- 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 Ryan Davis against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P21/02891/F, dated 24 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 1 no. front dormer to facilitate loft conversion.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. In the interest of clarity, the description of development above is taken from part E of the appeal form and the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Whilst the general surrounding streets are mixed in character, No. 25 Mangotsfield Road sits within a row of similar and distinctive traditional semi-detached properties extending up to No 51. The symmetrical nature and consistent unbroken roofscape of these dwellings contribute positively to their group character. Whilst No. 25 has been extended through a substantial two storey side extension, its set back and set down from the ridge ensures that the extension appears subservient, and that the original symmetry of the semi-detached unit is retained.
6. The extract provided from Supplementary Planning Document 'Householder Design Guide' (SPD) indicates that front elevation dormers should be as limited in scale to ensure they are not overbearing or dominant. The front dormer, whilst matching in materials to the main house and limited in width, would project significantly from the roof plane, and appear prominent and incongruous, detracting from the existing simple roof form. The dormer would

have a detrimental impact on the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and negatively impact the consistent appearance and character of the row of semi-detached properties and this part of the street scene.

7. The appellant references development at No. 23. This detached dwelling, like its neighbours to the east, is separate in terms of character and appearance from the row of distinct semi-detached dwellings that No. 25 forms part of. Therefore, the dormer and front projection to this property does not have a comparable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is also the case for the dormer bungalows identified nearby.
8. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There is therefore conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013), Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (PSP) and the SPD. These collectively require 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).

Other Matters

9. The appellant points to the extension being acceptable in terms of highways, residential amenity and other matters that are not in dispute between the parties. The Council has not objected to the proposal in respect of matters other than character and I have no reason to disagree.
10. The refusal reason also refers to PSP Policy PSP8, which sets out that development should not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of occupiers of the development or of nearby properties. This policy is therefore not relevant in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in conflict with the development plan. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed

George Baird

INSPECTOR