

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/22/3310703

229 North Road, Yate, South Gloucestershire BS37 7LG

- 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 & Mrs K Scott against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P22/05349/HH, dated 6 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is for an extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 229 North Road comprises a two storey semi-detached vernacular cottage which is located within a large plot of elongated proportions. The cottage has been extended a number of ways in the past, however these are largely subordinate in form.
4. 227 North Road adjoining has been extended to the side to a similar width to that proposed, but the fenestration pattern would be different and a more simple mono-pitched extension has been constructed across the rear elevation. I have taken this and other examples within the locality into account, and whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these or otherwise, ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
5. The Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document adopted March 2021 (SPD) where concerning side extensions, stipulates that they should be subservient in character and scale to its host by, amongst other things, extending to no more than half the width of the principal elevation. The SPD also requires a setting back of a side extension at least 300mm from the building line of the principal elevation and setting down the ridge and eaves height of any extension below the level of the existing roof ridge and eaves of the host building.

6. I accept that the extension to no227 has effectively created the appearance of a terrace, but nonetheless the appeal proposal before me would significantly elongate this further, such that the original form of the host dwelling and the semi-detached pair of which it forms part would be significantly engulfed by extensions to the side and rear; failing to provide any degree of subservience and giving rise to an appearance of overdevelopment. I can understand the reason for the appellants to want to extend the dwelling, so as to be able to accommodate their blended family and I note that the Council raises no objection to the principle of enlarging it, but as it stands I find that the proposal before me is unacceptable and would be unduly harmful upon the character and appearance of the area.
7. I therefore find that the proposed development would result in a building with inappropriate proportions that would not sufficiently reflect the scale nor integrate with the host dwelling, failing to follow the design principles as set out within the SPD and contrary to Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted December 2013) and Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted November 2017) which together only permit development where the highest possible standards of design are achieved having regard to siting, form, scale, height, massing, as well as paragraph 130.b) of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellants, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR