



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/22/3291445

85 Dakota Drive, Whitchurch, Bristol BS14 0TD

- 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 Richard Prince against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03328/H, dated 16 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension at 85 Dakota Drive, Whitchurch, Bristol BS14 0TD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03328/H, dated 16 June 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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: DRW01, Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans; DRW02, Existing and Proposed First Floor Plans; DRW03, Existing and Proposed Elevations; DRW04, Location Plan, Block Plan & Section, all submitted to the Local Planning Authority on 28 June 2021.
 - 3) Notwithstanding any indication given in the application form and supporting plans and documents 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.

Procedural Matter

2. Within the appeal form, the agent acting for the owner of the property was named as the appellant. However, the right of appeal rests with the original applicant and I have used the correct name accordingly in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey link-detached dwelling situated at the end of a cul-de-sac within a mid-to-late twentieth century housing estate. As with many estates of the period there is a prevailing sense of spaciousness due to

the regular and generous separation distances between properties. The dwelling is in a run of similar brick-built properties which are also characteristic of the period, being of simple design with little in the way of architectural embellishment. Each dwelling originally contained a ground floor porch on the right-hand side of the front elevation and two windows to the left, one at ground floor level and one directly above. The absence of a corresponding first floor window above the porch gives a slightly unbalanced appearance.

5. A number of properties in the row benefit from two-storey front extensions in the position of the original porch. The depth of those extensions varies slightly but they do not impact upon the spacious quality of the estate and are subservient in scale to the original dwellings. Moreover, given the asymmetrical appearance of the original properties the modest extensions set to one side have not unbalanced the overall composition of respective dwellings. The use of matching materials and roof pitches set lower than the main roof pitch, also ensures that the extensions are of a subservient scale.
6. Although the proposed extension would be slightly deeper than those seen elsewhere, the difference would be marginal and not readily discernible to those passing along the street due to the position of the dwelling in the corner of the cul-de-sac. The roofline would be set down from the main ridge, with a matching roof pitch, ensuring that the proposal would be subservient to the original property in scale and design. Although render was initially proposed, the appellant is prepared to accept a condition to ensure that matching brickwork is used. Given the absence of render elsewhere within the estate, such a condition is necessary to ensure that the extension conforms to the established palette of materials and to reduce its visual prominence.
7. I recognise that two storey extensions forward of the main building line may be unsympathetic in some circumstances, as noted in the Council's Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2005). However, in this instance, having regard to the design of the original property, the spacious character of the estate, the presence of similar extensions elsewhere, and the scale and design of the proposal, the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding estate. Given the absence of harm, the proposal would not set an undesirable precedent for future extensions elsewhere.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with the design related aims of policies BCS21 of the Bristol Local Plan Core Strategy (2011) and policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014).
9. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, conditions are necessary to ensure compliance with the approved plans, in the interests of clarity, and to ensure that matching materials are used, for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR