



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by M. P. Howell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday 10 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3283518

3 Reedley Road, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 3SR

- 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 Christian Rookes against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02763/H, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension including associated demolitions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension including associated demolitions at 3 Reedley Road, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 3SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02763/H, dated 17 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall not begin 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: 1400-P-050, 1400-P-051, 1400-P-100, 1400-P-101, 1400-P-102.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the plan 1400-P-102 and detailed on the submitted application form.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application form refers to the appellant's name as simply 'Rookes'. However, the Appeal Form and submissions indicate that the appellant is in fact 'Mr Christian Rookes.' Accordingly, I have reflected this in my banner heading above.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Reedley Road is a residential area with predominately semi-detached dwellings fronting the Road, with either a hipped or mansard style roof and are, for the most part, set back from the highway with a uniform building line. 3 Reedley Road is also set back from the road, but the design and appearance of the dwelling is unlike the neighbouring properties. In particular, the dwelling is

detached with a wide gable frontage and a simple pitched roof. No 3 is visible from close proximity as well as wider views being appreciable at the junction with Stoke Lane.

5. A two-storey extension is proposed to the side, with a link between the existing dwelling and the extension. The link would be set back from the main dwelling, with a deeper recess at first floor forming an asymmetrical pitched roof at the front. The remainder of the extension would be built in line with the front elevation and finished in a mixture of render, brick and timber cladding.
6. Although the extension would be large, it would be narrower than the existing front gable and set down from the main roof, resulting in a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the recessed link together with the roof design and mixture of materials would adequately break up the scale and massing of the extended front elevation. Accordingly, despite the proposal not being entirely set back, it would not appear as an overly dominant addition that would unacceptably alter the scale, character and appearance of the dwelling. Furthermore, having regard to the unique appearance of the dwelling in the street as well as the appropriate scale and design of the extension, the impact upon the wider character and appearance of the area is minimal.
7. I, therefore, conclude that the design and scale of the proposal would be appropriate and the impact upon the character and appearance of the area would not be unacceptable. As such, the scheme complies with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol City Council Core Strategy 2011 as well as Policies DM26, DM27, and DM30 of the Bristol City Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014, the Bristol City Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies and guidance, in general, require new development to respect the overall design and character of the host building and contribute positively to an area's local character.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance.
9. In addition to the statutory time limit, it is necessary in the interests of precision and clarity, to define the approved plans for the scheme. Furthermore, in order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, a condition ensuring the materials match the proposed finishes would be necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M. P. Howell

INSPECTOR