



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2022

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/22/3295964

9 Doulton Way, BRISTOL, BS14 9YD

- 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 Jacob Gardner against Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00354/H, is dated 24 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is First floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension at 9 Doulton Way, Bristol, BS14 9YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00354/H, dated 24 January 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: Drawing No. 001 A May 21 and Site Location Plan.
 - 3) All new external work and finishes and work of making good shall match existing original work adjacent in respect of materials used, detailed execution and finished appearance except where indicated otherwise on the approved drawings.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to a planning application that was not determined by the Council within the prescribed period. The Council have subsequently issued a statement for the purposes of this appeal highlighting that it would have refused the application for planning permission. The Council's concerns are that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. I have had regard to the Council's statement in framing the main issues.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 9 Doulton Way, is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on a residential street. Doulton Way is characterised by red brick

buildings with gabled features to the front elevation which are set back from the road behind small garden areas or areas of hardstanding. The consistency of design and materials has led to a sense of cohesion and uniformity along the street. Gaps between properties create a sense of spaciousness in the area.

5. The proposal is for a first floor side extension. The extension would be set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling and set back from the front elevation. In my view, the proposed extension would, therefore, appear as a sympathetic addition which would respect the scale and proportions of the host dwelling. I note that the proposed extension would not be set in from the side boundary. However, in my view, due to its modest size, set back and set down the proposal would, nevertheless, appear as a complementary and subordinate addition to the property.
6. Though the resultant dwelling would appear larger than some others in the area the key characteristics and sense of uniformity would be preserved. I noted examples of other properties where the built form broadly extended across the full width of the plot. The appeal proposal would become a further example of this, however, the neighbouring gable projection would remain visually dominant and the character of the area would be preserved in this key regard.
7. The materials would match those used elsewhere which would further ensure that the proposed extension would assimilate well within its context. Furthermore, despite the lack of a set in from the side boundary, the circumstances on this particular site are such that a substantial visual break between the dwelling at No 9 and the neighbouring dwelling would remain. This unobstructed gap would ensure that the sense of spaciousness which characterises the area would remain and that a 'terracing' effect would not occur in this instance.
8. For these reasons I consider that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would, therefore, comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, June 2011 (CS) which seeks to ensure that development delivers high quality urban design by, amongst other things, contributing positively to an area's character or identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness. The proposed development would also accord with Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan, July 2014 (LP). These policies reinforce the requirements of Policy BCS21 by, amongst other things, stating that development should respect the local pattern and grain of development, respond appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings and, where alterations to existing buildings are concerned, development should respect the siting, scale, form, proportions, materials, details and the overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.
9. I note that the proposed extension would not leave at least 1 metre between it and the adjoining boundary recommended by Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions, October 2005 (SPD). However, this is guidance and in my view, as I have expressed above the underlying aims of this element of the guidance to avoid harmful terracing effects would nevertheless be met. The proposal would meet

the expectations of the SPD with respect to other considerations for side extensions.

Conditions

10. In the interests of precision and clarity I have undertaken some minor editing and rationalisation of the conditions proposed by the Council. Alongside the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition with regard to the materials to be used.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and considering all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR