



---

# Appeal Decision

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

## Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 December 2021

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/21/3279860

#### 49 Cherington, Yate BS37 8UY

- 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 & Mrs Jones against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
  - The application Ref P21/03046/PDR, dated 30 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is a single storey, rear extension with mono-pitch tiled roof.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey, rear extension with mono-pitch tiled roof at 49 Cherington, Yate, Bristol, BS37 8UY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P21/03046/PDR, dated 30 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 543344-21-6, 543344-21-2, 543344-21-3, 543344-21-5.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### 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 Matter

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

### Main Issue

4. The effect on the living conditions of the host property, with particular regard to private garden space.

### **Reasons for the Recommendation**

5. No 49 Cherington is a modest two storey end of terrace property and is part of a wider residential development made up of similar properties, with their rear elevations facing the highway. Each property has a modest rear garden, which includes a garage building adjacent to the road.
6. The scale of the proposed extension is limited; however, it would reduce the rear garden space available to the occupiers of the property.
7. Policy PSP43 of the of the South Gloucestershire Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (PSP) refers to private amenity standards of all new residential units and does not mention extensions to existing dwellings. However, PSP Policy PSP38 does require development to not prejudice the provision of adequate private amenity space.
8. Whilst it is unclear as to how many bedrooms the existing property has, the remaining garden space would provide sufficient space to accommodate domestic items associated with a family sized dwelling such as play equipment and clothes drying area, and not be overly cramped. In addition, the property has a detached garage for storage. The modest extension would not have a significant impact on the size of the existing rear garden and there would remain a similar garden space to the neighbouring properties.
9. I conclude that the proposed extension would not result in the provision of inadequate private amenity space and would not therefore harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the property. There is no conflict with the amenity space requirements of PSP Policies PSP38 and PSP43.

### **Conditions**

10. The Council has suggested the imposition of a condition relating to the start date of development, and in addition to requiring compliance with the application plans. I consider these to be necessary in the interest of clarity. In addition, I agree that a condition requiring materials to match the existing original property is also necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed with the suggested conditions.

*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 allowed.

*Zoe Raygen*

INSPECTOR