
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: 10 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/22/3310940

287 Canford Lane, Westbury, Bristol BS9 3PH

- 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 Ben Holleley & Joanna Apperley against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02684/H, dated 27 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a double storey side extension with single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a double storey side extension with single storey rear extension at 287 Canford Lane, Westbury, Bristol BS9 3PH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 22/02684/H, dated 27 May 2022 subject to the conditions set out below:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans: 2008_287CL_X000, 2008_287CL_X001, 2008_287CL_X002, 2008_287CL_X003, 2008_287CL_D100 Rev B, 2008_287CL_D101 Rev B, 2008_287CL_D102 Rev B, 2008_287CL_D103 Rev B and 2008_287CL_D104 Rev B.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a two storey semi-detached house located within a residential area where many dwellings have been altered and extended over time, including similar extensions to those proposed before me. 285 Canford Lane to the east of the appeal site is a two storey detached house set some distance away from the shared boundary.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document entitled 'A Guide For Designing House Alterations and Extensions' adopted in October 2005 (SPD) stipulates that

where concerning side extensions to semi-detached houses they should be subservient to the existing house to maintain the property's architectural integrity, the balance of the pair and the character of the street; and this can be achieved by setting back the extension from the front wall of the house, and stepping down the roof ridge height. As a guide, a minimum set back of 1m should be provided and ideally at least 1m should be maintained between such an extension and the adjoining boundary.

5. I accept that the proposed extension is slightly wider than two thirds of that of the original dwelling and which would amount to a greater width than the two storey side extension already found on 289 Canford Lane. However, the existing situation is already of an unbalanced pair of houses and bearing in mind the appellant's general adherence to the Council's design guidelines, I consider that the proposed extension would appear subservient in form to the host dwelling.
6. Overall, the scale of the extension would respect the existing pattern and scale of development within the immediate area, with there being no single definitive design, scale and form of the two storey side extensions that have previously been constructed on neighbouring dwellings. I therefore conclude that by virtue of its overall scale and width that the proposed extensions would respect the existing character and pattern of development within the area. In addition to complying with the SPD, the scheme also complies with Policy BSC21 of the Bristol Development Core Strategy adopted June 2011 and Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies adopted July 2014, which together require new development in Bristol to deliver high quality urban design which contributes towards local character and distinctiveness having regard to a number of general principles, and specifically where concerning extensions to existing buildings will be expected to respect the site and scale, form, proportions and overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.

Other Matters

7. I note from the third party representation that there is concern raised that 2no trees within the hedgerow would be removed and therefore should be mitigated. However, in response to this the Council stipulates that these relate to two laurel bushes and do not meet the threshold for the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard to be enforced. I have been given no substantive reason to come to a different conclusion on this and therefore is not a determining factor in this appeal.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all others matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. Other than the standard time limit condition the Council recommends that conditions are imposed that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that materials match the existing building. I consider that in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area that these conditions are necessary.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR