



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2022

by C Rose BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/22/3302400

8 Blackthorn Drive, Bradley Stoke BS32 8BY

- 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 Terry Nash against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P22/01779/HH, dated 18 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is extension to side, front and rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development as set out above from the application form as neither party has provided written confirmation that a revised description has been agreed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties and the wider area with regard to the front and side extension; and,
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.7 Blackthorn Drive, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal building forms part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on Blackthorn Drive where the character is defined by dwellings which benefit from subservient front and side extensions, whether part of their original design or added as later additions.
5. The proposal would extend the existing front porch up to first floor level and add a first floor above the ground floor side extension. The side extension would be flush with the original front elevation, extending the existing eaves and ridge lines. As a result, these extensions would not be subservient to the original dwelling, creating a different appearance to the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and unbalancing the appearance of the pair. Given that it is

not common to find two-storey front and side extensions that are not subservient to properties on Blackthorn Drive, the proposal will harm the character and appearance of the properties and wider area.

6. I acknowledge that the side extension is less than half of the width of the original dwelling in accordance with the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document March 2011 (SPD). However, it is not set back from the building line of the front elevation, nor are the eaves and ridge height set down from the existing eaves and ridge as detailed in the SPD. The SPD also states that front extensions should not dominate the character of the host building and that two storey front extensions are largely unacceptable where they would upset the character of the street scene.
7. Although the appeal property is set back off the cul-de-sac with existing boundary walls to surrounding properties restricting views of the ground floor on approach, the first floor would be visible from Blackthorn Drive. In light of this and given the strong character of Blackthorn Drive with subservient side additions and lack of two-storey front extensions, the proposal would unbalance and diminish the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties and as a result be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Whilst I saw examples of front extensions to properties in Kemperley Way on my site visit that differed from the adjoining property, these were generally single storey and not combined with full-height side extensions. They do not therefore cause me to come to a different view on this main issue. I note reference by the appellant to other locations in Bradley Stoke where similar front and side extensions have been granted but I have no information regarding these.
9. Accordingly, in relation to this matter, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties and wider area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2027, Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan November 2017, and The Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document March 2021. Amongst other things, these require that development is designed to the highest standards, respond positively to and make a positive contribution to the distinctiveness of the area, and respect the form and scale of the street and surrounding area.

Living Conditions

10. The proposal would extend the first floor of the existing dwelling over the full footprint of the existing single storey side extension. The side extension would adopt the same eaves and ridge height as the main roof bringing the bulk of the building closer to the rear of No.7. The upward extension of the existing porch would also add to the bulk of the building when viewed from the rear of No.7 and its garden.
11. The rear elevation of No.7 is in close proximity to the side boundary and side elevation with the appeal dwelling. The side extension would be dominant to the occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling. In combination with the upward extension to the front porch, the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the outlook from the rear of the ground floor of No.7 and from its garden.

The overbearing impact would be particularly harmful from the ground floor living room at the rear of No.7 that would directly face the appeal proposal.

12. I recognise that the front extension would be further from the rear of No.7 than the 12m distance referred to by the Council in reference to the Window-to-Wall Test detailed in the guidance in the Technical Advice Note: Assessing Residential Amenity June 2016. However, in combination with the side extension, which is less than the 12m distance leads me to find that the extensions would result in an overbearing and dominant feature to the detriment of the outlook of the occupiers of No.7.
13. The appellant has referred to an extension to No. 154 Ellicks Close, Bradley Stoke that they consider results in a similar relationship to the appeal proposal with No.7, but I have limited information on this.
14. For the reasons given above the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Blackthorn Drive and would therefore conflict with Policies CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2027, Policies PSP8 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan November 2017, and The Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document March 2021 which, amongst other things, require that development proposals do not create unacceptable living conditions, have an unacceptable impact on, or prejudice the residential amenity of, occupiers of nearby properties.

Other Matters

15. Whilst the Grounds of Appeal submitted by the appellant refer to a letter of the 25 April 2022, I have not been provided with a copy of this.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rose

INSPECTOR