



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2022

by Helen Davies MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/22/3296962

23 Little Headley Close, Bishopsworth, Bristol BS13 7PJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bird against Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06251/H is dated 21 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 23 Little Headley Close, Bishopsworth, Bristol BS13 7PJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/06251/H, dated 21 November 2021, 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 drawings referenced 'site plan 21-06251', and '001 dated Oct '21 (Existing and Proposed Plans, General arrangement)'.
 - 3) All new external work and finishes shall match the existing adjacent works and finishes in respect of materials used and finished appearance, except where specified otherwise on the approved drawings.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal was submitted in the name of Miss Alaina Feeney. The appellant has confirmed in writing that Miss Feeney is authorised to act on his behalf.
3. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the Council's failure to determine the planning application within the statutory timescale. However, the Council has provided an appeal statement which sets out the reasons why they would have refused planning permission had the jurisdiction to determine the application remained with them. In setting out the main issues I have had regard to matters raised by the Council as well as observations made during my site visit.
4. The Council appeal statement says the dwelling is situated on a corner plot. This is incorrect. I have determined the appeal on the submitted drawings which show the dwelling is not on a corner.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

6. Little Headley Close is a modern residential development which comprises of two storey semi-detached dwellings along with the occasional detached dwelling. Dwellings are set back from the road with the building line in this section of Headley Close being modestly stepped to follow the shape of the road. The surrounding area features a variety of design styles and many of the dwellings have front porches. There are also a number of dwellings along Little Headley Close with single storey extensions that project forward of the main front elevation.
7. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling. The proposal is for a two storey side extension with a single storey element projecting forward and wrapping around part of the front of the dwelling.
8. The two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation and set down at the roof ridge ensuring it would be subservient to the existing dwelling. The side of the extension would be close to the boundary with 25 Little Headley Close, which is a detached dwelling. This would reduce the gap between the dwellings but a sufficient gap would be retained at first floor to avoid a terracing effect. The single storey front projection would be closer to the street but would still be set well back. As there is already variation in the building line and space between dwellings the proposal would not be unacceptably detrimental to the established pattern and grain or spaciousness of development.
9. Whilst the works may pre-date current planning policy, the pair of semi-detached dwellings at No 23 and No 21 is already unbalanced to an extent by the single storey wrap around extension with front projection at No 21. The modest proposed single storey front projection would extend across around half of the existing frontage of No 23 and its depth and width would be similar to the existing extension at No 21. Consequently, the proposal would not significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
10. Although the proposal would be visible from the street, it would not be excessively large or dominant. It would generally be in accordance with the guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (2005).
11. I am aware that a similar scheme to that proposed under this appeal was refused at 1 Little Headley Close and a subsequent appeal dismissed. Whilst details of this are not before me, I note that No 1 is a corner plot where a side extension which incorporated a front projection would have taken the built form relatively close to the pavement. This would have closed down the openness of the corner and made the extension highly prominent and incongruous. The appeal site is not on a corner so the context and impact of the proposal is very different to No 1.
12. I conclude that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the development would comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol

Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (SADMP), which amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is well designed and respects the surrounding context and built form.

Conditions

13. The Council have suggested conditions, which the appellant has been made aware of and raised no objections to. I have considered the suggested conditions and amended and reordered them as necessary in the interests of precision and clarity in order to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
14. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area a condition is necessary to ensure the use of matching materials in the external surfaces of the development.

Conclusion

15. 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 and planning permission granted.

Helen Davies

INSPECTOR