



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 November 2021

by Helen Davies

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Tuesday 30 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3283433

3 Tilling Road, Horfield, Bristol BS10 5AQ

- 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 Peter Johnson against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01651/H, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is part demolition and enlargement of original porch to provide WC, utility and entrance hallway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part demolition and enlargement of original porch to provide WC, utility and entrance hallway, at 3 Tilling Road, Horfield, Bristol BS10 5AQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01651/H, dated 23 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 1000 rev A - Site location plan; 1120 rev A - Existing floor plans and elevations; 1220 rev C - Proposed floor plans, sections and elevations.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan No. 1220 rev C.

Preliminary Matters

2. The main parties disagree about what should be considered as the original footprint of the dwelling and therefore how much of the proposed development should be considered as being an addition. The Council refer to the development as a 'front extension to function as a porch', whereas the appellant refers to an 'enlarged porch'. I have referred to the proposal as an 'enlarged porch' as this is the term used in the description of development. Notwithstanding this, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings and assessed the effect the proposed development would have on the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is a mid-terrace dwelling in a predominantly residential area. The layout of the area is characterised by a series of relatively short terraces. The canopy above the door appears to be original to the dwellings along Tilling Road. Around half of the canopies have been partially or fully enclosed, in a wide variety of styles. Several dwellings, including 5 Tilling Road which adjoins the appeal site, have replaced the flat canopy with a pitched roof porch.
5. There is a step down between each of the dwellings in the terrace containing Nos 1, 3, 5, and 7 Tilling Road, so the ridge and eaves line is stepped. This terrace is also set a few meters further back from the road than the next terrace which starts at No 9. Consequently, the building line in this section of Tilling Road is staggered, rather than consistent. In addition, there is a detached and a pair of semi-detached dwellings opposite the appeal site, which are different in character and appearance to the rest of Tilling Road.
6. The combination of the factors set out above means there is a lack of uniformity in both the pattern and grain of development and the appearance of the front elevations in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
7. The front elevation of the appeal property is set back from the street with a good sized driveway and front garden. The dwelling has a flat canopy above the door which extends across around half of the frontage. The canopy has a brick pillar to the centre and is enclosed on one side and open on the other.
8. The proposed development would be a modest size, constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling, with a pitched roof and a gable over the door. Therefore, the development would be visually subservient and would generally respect the proportions, roof pitch and materials of the host dwelling.
9. The depth of the extended porch would be approximately 1.6 metres, which is deeper than the existing canopy and enclosed porch by around 0.8 metres. I acknowledge that this would be deeper than other porches on Tilling Road. However, due to the set back from the road, and the existing staggered building line between No 7 and No 9, the modest additional depth would not be incongruous within the streetscene.
10. Given the location and modest scale of the proposed development, and a surrounding context which lacks uniformity, I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to local character and distinctiveness.
11. I note that the proposed drawings include new brick and timber boundary treatments to either side at the front. These would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the site or its surroundings. The Council have stated these would be acceptable in design terms.
12. My attention has been drawn to examples of other porch extensions in the area, particularly along Rudhall Grove. Full details of these are not before me, but I viewed the examples during my site visit. Rudhall Grove is a short cul-de-sac off Tilling Road and contains a number of porch extension of various sizes. However, these extensions are not read in the same context as the proposal before me. Therefore, the porch extensions on Rudhall Grove are not directly comparable to the appeal site and in any event, each case must be considered on its own merits.

13. I conclude that the proposed enlarged porch would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the development would comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011; Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan 2014; and Supplementary Planning Document 2, which together seek to ensure that development is well designed and responds appropriately to local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

14. The Council have stated that the proposed development would set an unacceptable precedent for future development. However, as I have found that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area, it would not create a precedent for other developments that would cause harmful effects in these regards.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure the use of appropriate materials in the external surfaces of the development.

Conclusion

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

Helen Davies

INSPECTOR