



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by Laura Cuthbert BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday 11 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/22/3290847

18 Gayner Road, Bristol, BS7 0SW

- 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 Martin Thomas against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P20/01920/F, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'remove existing front porch and replace with new larger front porch with disabled wheelchair access and internal storage for wheelchair'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as 'remove existing front porch and replace with new larger front porch with disabled wheelchair access and internal storage for wheelchair' at 18 Gayner Road, Bristol, BS7 0SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P20/01920/F, dated 31 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: - Site Plan, Location Plan Drawing No.3, Existing and Proposed Block Plan Drawing No. 4, Existing and Proposed Floor Plan Drawing No. 5, Proposed front porch plan Drawing No.6, Proposed elevations Drawing No.7, Existing and proposed front elevation Drawing No. 8 and Existing Front and Side Elevations Drawing No.9.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be as shown on the planning application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semi detached dwelling in a street of similar properties, a number of which have been altered in the form of extensions, hip to gable conversions and different facing materials. The appeal building has an

existing porch to the front which, in this varied context, visually unbalances the pair of dwellings.

4. The proposed development would effectively enlarge the existing porch but due to its overall land take and height it would remain subservient to the host building. The visual unbalancing effect it would have when compared to the adjoined building would be emphasised but in the wider context I have mentioned above, such an effect would be comfortably subsumed, taking into account also that the altered larger ground floor window will remain aligned with the existing.
5. The extent of variation in the street scene would also ensure that the increased solid to void ratio on the front elevation would not be unduly harmful. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the use of grey slate type roofing tiles, whilst not matching the existing main roof, would sit acceptably in the context of other dwellings which also use different roofing treatments. I am also mindful of the appellant's assertions that such tiles have been used elsewhere on the rear of the appeal building.
6. The proposed development would not therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted 2017), which together seek to ensure development achieves the highest standards of design and makes a positive contribution to the distinctiveness of the area. The proposals would also be in accordance with the principles within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seek good design sympathetic to the local area.
7. The Council Officer's report makes reference to the South Gloucestershire Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted March 2021), which states that front extensions are unacceptable where it would upset the character and rhythm of the street scene. Given my findings above, I do not consider this would be the case and thus the appeal scheme would comply with the SPD in this regard.

Conditions

8. As well as the standard time condition, conditions have been imposed to set out the approved plans and require the use of materials set out on the application form in the interests of a good quality external appearance.

Conclusion

9. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan and as such the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Laura Cuthbert

INSPECTOR