



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/Z0116/D/22/3302223

41A St. Johns Crescent, Bristol BS3 5EL

- 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 Ms Haiyan Xu, GHL Properties against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00724/H, dated 11 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension at 41A St. Johns Crescent, Bristol BS3 5EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00724/H, dated 11 February 2022, 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: PL01 and PL02A.
 - 3) Prior to any development above ground level, details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area is characterised by semi-detached and terraced properties of a similar design and appearance. The appeal property is unusual in the immediate area being the only detached dwelling. Whilst benefitting from a similar footprint to the individual semi-detached and terraced dwellings on St. John Crescent, the detached form does not reflect the character of the wider area.
4. Compared to the existing appearance of the dwelling, the increased footprint as a result of the proposal, in addition to the increased bulk, would result in the dwelling being more in character with the scale and footprint of built form of development in the surrounding area. I do not therefore find the footprint or

scale of development harmful to the character and appearance of the area given the extended dwelling would better reflect the larger dimensions of nearby pairs of semi-detached properties.

5. The Council have drawn attention to Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 (A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions) 2005 (SPD), which states that side extensions to semi-detached houses should be subservient to the existing house. The SPD goes on to state that this can be achieved through setting back the extension from the front wall of the house and stepping down the roof ridge height. However, as the appeal proposal relates to a detached dwelling, of more relevance to this appeal is point ii. on page 11 of the SPD in relation to detached houses. This states that for detached houses there is greater flexibility to extend and that it is less important for an extension to be subservient depending on the property and character of the area.
6. The character of the area is not one where new built form is generally set back or down, as reflected by development to the side of No. 56 St. Johns Crescent. Given that subservient side extensions are not characteristic of the immediate area, I do not find these design features necessary in this instance. The proposed extension would have a smaller footprint than the existing dwelling and be of a similar design. Due to this, the extension would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the existing dwelling, subject to the use of matching materials.
7. The appeal proposal would also comply with the SPD in relation to Section v. on page 12 in relation to extensions at corners as the building lines to both St. Johns Crescent and Greendale Road would be respected. I note that the extension would bring the built form closer to Greendale Road, and therefore reduce the openness of the corner and make the built form more prominent. However, because of the built development already on the site, given that the proposal would follow the building line to Greendale Road, and due to the high boundary wall surrounding the site, I do not find that the development would be overly prominent, or that a further reduction in the openness of the corner would be harmful.
8. By virtue of the location of the extension to the side of the dwelling, and given the limited depth of rear garden, I acknowledge that the resultant dwelling would benefit from limited external space. However, this is not highly noticeable from St. Johns Crescent or Greendale Road due to the boundary wall. In light of this, and with a usable amount of external area remaining, the reduced space will not harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. As a result of my findings above, the overall design and scale of the proposal would not result in the dwelling appearing out of character with the area. Nor would it appear overly prominent or incongruent in the street scene. Accordingly, the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The appeal scheme would therefore comply with Policies BCS21, DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy June 2011, and Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 (A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions) October 2005 which, amongst other things, requires a high quality of urban design, and a design that makes a positive contribution to an area's local character, distinctiveness, and identity.

Other Matters

10. The Council have referred to the planning history for the site, but I have limited information in relation to this and must consider the individual circumstances of each appeal. In this instance, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to conditions. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary for a condition to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition is also necessary to ensure that external materials for the extension are agreed in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

C Rose

INSPECTOR