



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 November 2021

by Helen Davies

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3283106

15 Elmtree Drive, Bishopsworth, Bristol BS13 8LY

- 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 D Holt against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03775/H, dated 9 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is a two storey end of terrace dwelling in a predominantly residential area. Elmtree Drive and the surrounding streets are characterised by a series of short terraces and semi-detached dwellings, with hipped roof forms and distinct spaces between neighbouring side elevations. Whilst a number of dwellings have been extended to the side at ground floor, the spaces between dwellings remains relatively uniform at first floor. These visual breaks in the built form contribute an openness to the streetscene, which is a positive element of the character and distinctiveness of the area. There is currently a distinct space at first floor level between the side of the host dwelling and the side of 17 Elmtree Drive, which makes a positive contribution to the openness of the area.
4. The proposed development would result in a two story side extension, adjoining the boundary with No 17, which is the start of the neighbouring terrace. There is already a single storey extension on the same footprint as the proposed development.
5. The proposed first floor side extension would not be set back from the front elevation, or set in from the side boundary, and would lack a set down at the roof. Despite the proposed use of sympathetic materials, a hipped roof form, and respect for the established building line, the proposed development would not be visually subservient to the host dwelling.

6. The proposed development would be a dominant addition to the dwelling. The closing of the space between the dwellings would fail to respect the local pattern and grain of development, and the distinctive sense of openness between dwellings in this section would be much reduced. Taken together, these changes would cause unacceptable harm to the streetscene, despite the proposed continuation of the terrace building line and roof ridge.
7. I note the concerns raised by the Council regarding the creation of a terracing effect if No 17 wished to similarly extend their dwelling. However, I have no such proposal for No 17 before me. Should any such proposal be submitted, it would need to be considered on its own merits.
8. My attention has been drawn to examples of other two storey side extensions in the area. Details of these are not before me, but I viewed the examples during my site visit. The extensions are visible within the streetscene, but the context is quite different to the appeal site meaning they are not read in the same context as the proposal before me. Both examples are located at a corner, so the extensions do not result in the closing down of space between side elevations of neighbouring dwellings. Therefore, the example extensions are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal and in any event, each case must be considered on its own merits.
9. I acknowledge that Supplementary Planning Document 2, A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions 2005 (SPD 2) states that 'for end of terrace houses, it is often more suitable to continue the terrace building line and roof ridge height so that the extension becomes part of the terrace'. However, this advice has to be considered alongside all other relevant guidance and policy. SPD 2 also states that 'successful extensions usually appear subservient to the original house'.
10. I conclude that the proposed first floor side extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the development would not comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011; Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014; and SPD 2, which together seek to ensure that development is well designed and responds appropriately to local character and distinctiveness.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Davies

INSPECTOR