
Appeal Decision

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

Decision by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/21/3279573 246 Hanham Road, Kingswood BS15 8PB

- 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 Gavin Williams against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P21/02544/F, dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2021.
 - The development proposed was originally described as *'removing and replacing the existing detached garage with a new attached garage incorporating a utility room and WC, along with reconfiguring the existing kitchen & utility rooms into a combination kitchen/diner'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the installation of 1no rear dormer with French doors and Juliet balcony.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to demolition of detached garage. Erection of a single storey side and rear extension to form attached garage and additional living accommodation at 246 Hanham Road, Kingswood BS15 8PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P21/02544/F, dated 1 April 2021, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, 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: AL (00)01, AL (02)04, AL (02)05, AL (02)01, insofar as the drawings relate to the single storey side and rear extension.
 - 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

3. 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.

Preliminary Matters

4. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details

that the development comprises the demolition of detached garage. Erection of a single storey side and rear extension to form attached garage and additional living accommodation. Installation of 1no rear dormer with French doors and Juliet balcony. For clarity, I have therefore, taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice and used this description as set out in my decision.

5. The appellant has set out that the dormer and loft conversion is not part of the proposed scheme. However, the Council included the dormer in consideration of the proposal, and I have not been provided with any substantive evidence, as to reach an alternative conclusion as to why the dormer should not be considered.
6. Moreover, in any event the proposal before me is what is depicted on the proposed plans and it is the submitted plans which I have considered the appeal against and upon which I have based my decision. As such I will consider the same scheme, including the dormer.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. No.246 Hanham Road is a traditional two storey end of terrace property located on a busy residential street. The property has been substantially extended through a detached garage/outbuilding to its rear and a part two storey part single storey rear projection. The terrace is made up of similar two storey properties, opposite are larger semi-detached properties and immediately to the south, the neighbouring properties are semi-detached bungalows. There are also a number of flat roofed garage or side additions within the vicinity of the site. The surrounding area is therefore mixed in character and appearance.
9. The Supplementary Planning Document 'Householder Design Guide' (2021) (SPD) suggests that side extensions should not ideally extend by more than 1/3 of the width of the original property. This is to ensure subservience.
10. The proposed ground floor extension, whilst substantial in scale, would incorporate a new garage in a similar position to the existing structure, set back considerably from the front of the property. The extension would not extend to the rear past the existing rear projection. Although, in combination with the existing single storey projection there would be a significant increase in footprint.
11. I acknowledge that the width of the extension extends to greater than a 1/3 of the original property and would be in conflict with the SPD guidance. However, when viewed from the rear, it would be broken up by a step back of the side portion, which replaces the existing garage structure. It would therefore appear as a subservient addition that would not over dominate the original building or compromise its existing character, nor that of the wider terrace and street scene.
12. Furthermore, the flat roof of the extension would match that of the existing garage structure and would not appear as an incongruous addition. Whilst the roof lantern would be visible from the highway, the visual impact of the

extension from the street scene would not be significantly greater than the existing garage.

13. I conclude that the proposed ground floor extension would not be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property or the surrounding area. Thus, even if there is a breach of guidance on the width of the extension it would still accord with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) (CS) and Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (PSP). These policies require development to reach a high standard of design and ensure that extensions do not harm the balance and proportions of the original building and street scene.
14. The proposed rear dormer would be substantial in scale. Whilst set slightly down from the ridge and in from one side, it would dominate the rear roof plane. The design and proportions of the dormer, including the French doors, would not correspond to that of the existing rear elevation with regard to windows. The resultant visual impact would be significant, and the dormer would overwhelm the existing rear elevation. Therefore, it would be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the host dwelling.
15. The dormer would be highly visible to the surrounding properties, in addition to being visible from glimpses along Forest Road at the rear. Given the unsympathetic nature of the roof addition and the harm identified to the existing property, the dormer would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
16. I conclude that the proposed dormer would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with the requirement to not harm the balance and proportions of the original building and street scene of CS Policy CS1 and PSP Policy PSP38.
17. It would also be at odds with the SPD which states that flat roofed box-type dormers are not normally considered appropriate, as they do not represent good design due to their visual impact.

Other matters

18. A neighbour suggests moving the extension back from the road, in order to reduce the impact of it upon the neighbouring property. Given the single storey nature of the extension, it would not appear overly imposing from the side elevation of No.248. It is noteworthy that the Council found similarly in this regard. Matters relating to the boundary are private matters and not a material planning consideration.

Conditions

19. A condition relating to the start date of development and compliance with the application plans is necessary as this provides certainty.
20. I have imposed a condition specifying materials are to match the existing dwelling, this is also indicated on the application form and in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

21. I have found that the rear dormer would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area. There are no material considerations that justify granting permission for this part of the proposal contrary to the development plan.
22. The proposed ground floor extension is however a separate and clearly severable development from the loft conversion, and I have found that it would not result in harm. Therefore, I recommend that a split decision would be a logical outcome, by dismissing the proposed dormer and allowing the erection of a single storey extension subject to the conditions set out above.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

23. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, a split decision is issued.

KA Taylor

INSPECTOR