

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/22/3309471
25 Goodwin Drive, Bristol, BS14 0DR

- 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 Mrs S Bryant against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03911/H, dated 10 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing side extensions and part double story side extension with single story side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. Arrangements had been made for me to assess the proposals from within the neighbouring property at 27 Goodwin Drive, which I did.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, and (b) on the living conditions of the residents of 27 Goodwin Drive with reference to outlook, visual impact, and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property stands within a large residential estate and in a street where the predominant built form is chalet bungalows with dormers. The host property is a semi-detached property which has been significantly extended on the ground floor. The aim of the proposal is to demolish most of the extant ground floor extensions so to build afresh at this level and to introduce a first floor element in the gap between Nos 25 & 27.
5. The Council objects to both elements of the scheme - on the ground floor due to its extensive scale, and on the first floor due to its alleged adverse visual impact on the street scene, largely because of its prominent position on a bend.
6. To my mind, given that the ground floor extensions have been in place for some time, it would seem unreasonable to object to their replacement, especially since they do not cause material harm. As to the first floor extension proposed, its design is not dissimilar to others I saw in the area,

including one virtually opposite at No 22. In terms of its scale and design, I do not consider it would look out of place in respect of the host property or in its wider visual context.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would sit acceptably in the street without harming the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. Accordingly, no conflict arises with the design provisions and requirements of policies BCS21 of the Bristol Local Plan, Core Strategy (CS); and policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (DMP), applicable to residential extensions.

Living conditions

8. The next-door property, No 27, stands immediately to the south-east of the appeal property. The wall facing the appeal property is close to the side boundary with No 25, and contains two clearly glazed windows serving a bedroom and kitchen respectively. I could see that meals prepared in the kitchen are also consumed there.
9. The flank wall of the proposed first floor extension would bring development very close to the common side boundary, virtually closing the gap between the properties at first floor level. The outlook from the kitchen and bedroom to the west would be dominated at close quarters by the bulk of the first floor extension. The outcome is that users of the bedroom and kitchen would feel hemmed-in and oppressed by the presence of the extension, which would make No 27 a very less pleasant place to live. The effect on light would not be so material, given that the kitchen, in particular, has another window facing the front.
10. I conclude on this issue that the proposal at first floor level would lead to harmful consequences on the living conditions currently enjoyed by the residents of 27 Goodwin Drive by reason of its dominating and oppressive effect. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of CS policy BCS21 and DMP policy DM30 which aim to safeguard the amenity of existing development and neighbouring occupiers.

Other matters

11. I have taken account of the references to the Council's published design guidance, but no other matter raised is of such strength as to outweigh the matters that led me to my overall conclusions set out below.

Overall conclusions

12. I find in favour of the appellant in respect of the first issue identified at the outset, that is, the effect of the proposals on local character and appearance. As to the second issue, I find that the proposed development would cause material harm to neighbouring residents. This is sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

