



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/23/3314917

19 Kings Avenue, Hanham, Bristol BS15 3JN

- 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 Andrew Cross and Mrs Pamela Cross against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P22/05962/HH, dated 13 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor side extension over existing garage and utility room to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the proposal from the Council's Decision Notice, which is more accurate than the planning application form. The appellants have used this revised description in the appeal form and so I am satisfied that no parties would be prejudiced.
3. The appellant has referred to indicative 'marked up' amended plans having been submitted to the Council. However, these were not before me, and I have made my decision on the basis of the plans on which the Council made its decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property consists of a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling, located on a corner where Kings Avenue meets Queens Drive. The dwelling has previously been extended to its side, including a two-storey extension and a subservient single-storey garage. The proposal seeks to erect a further first-floor extension above the garage.
6. The South Gloucestershire Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted March 2021, advises that to ensure successful integration, house extensions should respect the character of the host. The roof of the proposal would have a hipped end, mirroring that of the existing property, and would have a lower ridge. The proposal would not increase the footprint of the dwelling.

7. However, the property has previously been significantly extended, and the proposal would further increase the length, mass and scale of its first floor and roof. As such, the proposal would result in a building that would be further out of proportion with the original house and so would dominate it, appearing discordant. Furthermore, the resultant dwelling would be significantly wider above ground floor level than the similar width of the other dwellings in the terrace, thus appearing out of place. For these reasons, the proposal would fail to integrate with the existing property or its context and would have a less than successful appearance, contrary to the SPD.
8. Furthermore, the proposal would be located to the side of the dwelling, in a prominent corner position. It would extend the dwelling further beyond the consistent frontage building line of properties on Queens Drive to its rear. As such, the additional scale and mass of the proposal would appear large and excessively dominant, particularly when viewed from Queens Drive. As a result, the proposal would harm the street scene.
9. For the reasons given, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy (SGCS), adopted December 2013, and Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan, adopted November 2017. These policies require the highest possible standard of design, that respect (amongst other things) the scale and massing of the site and its context. For similar reasons, the proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires that development is well designed and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would provide accommodation for an elderly and disabled relative of the appellant. I fully appreciate the significance of the proposal to the needs of the family, both now and in the future, and that other options to provide this accommodation have been considered but discounted. From the information provided by the appellant, including the South Gloucestershire Ageing Better Plan 2019-2023, I am mindful of the needs of older people and the support in the SGCS for Extra Care housing. It would also free up another home.
11. However, planning permission runs with the land and is primarily concerned with the public interest, rather than personal circumstances, and I am only able to give limited weight to these matters. As such, the benefits identified would not overcome the harm identified, particularly for a permanent extension that would remain long after such circumstances may have changed. No concerns were raised regarding the living conditions of nearby properties in terms of outlook or in other respects. Nevertheless, this does not change my findings in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I have found conflict with the Development Plan as a whole. The material considerations in this case do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the Development Plan. This leads me to conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

O Marigold INSPECTOR