



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/22/3303473

5 Quakers Close, Downend, South Gloucestershire BS16 6JH

- 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 M Ireland against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P22/01948/HH, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2022.
 - The development is a side and rear extension to the kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At my site visit I saw that the development appears to have largely been completed and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow located in a cul-de-sac of similar properties within an established residential area. There are two detached bungalows on either side of the entrance to Quakers Close where it meets Quakers Road with three pairs of semi-detached bungalows arranged to create a symmetrical layout. Except for the appeal property, all other bungalows have hipped roofs. This prevalent roof form combined with the symmetrical layout creates a balanced uniform appearance which positively contributes to the character of the area.
5. Along with other alterations, the appeal property has been extended to the side and the hipped roof has been altered to a gable end. This change unacceptably disrupts the roof profile of the host building which results in an incongruous building form at odds with surrounding properties. It also disrupts the existing balanced appearance of the semi-detached pair and harmfully breaks up the existing uniform appearance of the cul-de-sac. As a result, the extension appears as a discordant and alien feature in the streetscene.
6. Views from Quakers Road are limited due to the appeal site being located in the corner of the cul-de-sac. However, the harmful impact is apparent in views from Quakers Close itself and consequently the discordant addition is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. With the exception of the change

to the roof profile as part of the side extension, other elements of the development, including the rear box dormer do not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area. However, that does not justify harmful development.

7. I therefore conclude that overall, the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area in conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan – Core Strategy 2006-2027 and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan – Policies, Sites and Places Plan adopted November 2017. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure new development achieves the highest possible standard of design and site planning, responds constructively to local distinctiveness and extensions respect the building form, scale, proportions, and architectural style/detailing of the street and surrounding area.
8. The development also conflicts with the guidance provided in the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted March 2021, which amongst other things, highlights that the roof of a dwelling has a major impact on the character of the building and performs an important role within the wider streetscene. The SPD goes on to highlight that alterations to the main hip roof of a house by materially changing its form, such as gabling off an existing hip roof will not normally be permitted.

Other Matters

9. The appellant states that but for the infilling of a small recess, the proposal would constitute permitted development. However, insufficient evidence has been provided to allow me to definitively assess whether certain elements, including the side extension, would fall within the definition of permitted development rights. Consequently, I give the possibility that the appellant might be able to rely on permitted development rights as a fallback very limited weight in the determination of the appeal and this matter does not justify harmful development at the appeal site.
10. The appellant highlights that the Council have been inconsistent in their decision making given local extensions nearby. However, there does not appear to be any examples of a similar extension in Quakers Close itself. Therefore, any other examples and their impact are materially different from this proposal. In any event, even if there are other examples in the locality, that does not justify this proposal which I have found would unacceptably harm the character and appearance the host building and the wider area. Similarly, while I note the proposal would provide a modern living environment for the appellant's family, that matter does not justify harmful development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Overall, I conclude that the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made otherwise in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR