
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3280687

60 Lewis Road, Bedminster Down, Bristol BS13 7JB

- 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 Mrs H Phillips against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03177/H, dated 8 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 60 Lewis Road, Bedminster Down, Bristol BS13 7JB in accordance with the terms of the application, 21/03177/H, dated 8 June 2021, 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 plan: PLN-1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 60 Lewis Road forms one half of a semi-detached pair of dwellings. Similar dwellings and terraces characterise the surrounding streetscene. As originally constructed, it appears that all such dwellings featured a regular rectilinear form and footprint lacking rear extensions. Many dwellings have been enlarged since, including No 60 and the attached dwelling, 58 Lewis Road.
4. Whilst a rearward projecting 2-storey extension has been added to the side of No 60, No 58 has had a single storey lean-to extension added across its rear. Both types of extension appear reasonably common within the locality.
5. The proposed extension would consist of 2 parts: a lean-to and a garden room. The lean-to would project no further back than that at No 58 and would otherwise align with the rear wall of the existing 2 storey extension at No 60. It would therefore be contained by, consistent with, and would consolidate the

existing built form. The garden room would in contrast be flat roofed and would distinctly project. The 2 parts of the extension would therefore be perceived differently, and not as a whole.

6. The garden room would be modest in size and set below the eaves line of the lean-to, reflecting the steep fall in ground level to the rear of No 60. This is repeated along the east side of Lewis Road, elsewhere giving rise to the construction of projecting raised decks, including at No 58. The garden room would occupy a similar position but would differ in character and mass. It would nonetheless appear clearly subservient in form to the host dwelling and would have a very limited visual presence outside the plot.
7. Indeed, though an exceptionally tall person might glimpse the roof of the garden room over the boundary fence, it would otherwise be concealed from public view. Little would be visible even from No 58 given the height of existing screening along the side of the deck to its rear. As the extent to which any change was perceptible from outside the plot would be limited, the extent to which the development would have a perceived effect on the character and appearance of the area at large would also be limited.
8. Considered in combination with previous extensions the original footprint of the dwelling would be virtually doubled. The extent of the garden room's rearward projection would also be greater than appears typical within the immediate setting. Be that as it may, given my findings above, this would cause harm.
9. Conflict with Supplementary Planning Document Number 2: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions 2005 (the SPD) has been identified. This sets out rules of thumb for the extension of semi-detached dwellings of similar type to that in question, including in relation to how far an extension should ideally project. For such guidance to be meaningfully applied in the current case however, account must be taken of the fact that neither No 60 nor No 58 are in their original forms. Having done this above, I see no fundamental conflict between the scheme and guidance set out within the SPD.
10. Insofar as concern has been raised that allowing the Appeal would create a 'precedent', I have considered the scheme on its own particular merits, which may well vary elsewhere.
11. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the development would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy DM26 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2014 (the DMP) which amongst other things seeks to secure development whose design responds appropriately to existing buildings; Policy DM30 of the DMP, which seeks to secure extensions whose design respects the host building and broader street scene; Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Local Plan 2011 which seeks to secure development that contributes positively to an area's character and identity; and the SPD.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR