



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2023

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/23/3316798

2 Elgar Close, Clevedon BS21 5BS

- 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 Matthew Hector against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 22/P/2420/FUH, dated 6 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing attached side garage and replace with a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the consideration of the original application, the scheme was amended. The Council provided a list of the refused plans for the appeal, which included a proposed block plan and a proposed section through side extension (dwg nos EC/22/06 and EC/22/10) that show a proposed front gable element that is neither depicted on the proposed elevations nor upon the proposed floor plan drawings (dwg nos EC/22/09 Rev A, EC/22/07, and EC/22/08 Rev A). The Council have confirmed that the gable is not part of the proposal, and as this is consistent with the evidence of the appellant, I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host building and upon the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-of-terraced house within an area comprising similar ages and styles of mostly houses. Like many of the other houses within the estate, 2 Elgar Close (No 2) is set back from the public highway behind a front garden. The repeated set back of the houses from the public footway behind similarly sized front gardens creates a spacious setting to the roads, and there are long views available from Kenn Moor Drive of the houses forming lines that frame the highway. This, along with the repeated palettes of materials and

similar styles of the houses, gives a planned, cohesive appearance to the estate.

5. No 2 fronts Elgar Close, and it has side and rear gardens that are bordered by Kenn Moor Drive. There is a tall wall separating the rear garden from the public footway, with a gate near to the existing single storey garage. The proposed two-storey extension would continue the front and rear elevations of the house, with the flank wall being close to and at one point immediately adjacent to the public footway. This close proximity would form an abrupt and imposing enclosure of the public realm, and given the height and proximity of the extension to the highway, it would be visible from long distances away. Whilst there has been no local objection to the proposal, this does not mitigate the disruptive impact of the extension in an area where no one property dominates.
6. There would be a narrow gap between part of the extension with the public footway, but the limited separation that would exist would do little to ameliorate the intimidating dominance of the flank wall. There are other houses that are close to the footway, including some within corner plots, but none of those nearby nor the existing garage of No 2 have such a close juxtaposition to the footway as that proposed. The repeated relationships of the houses with the highway is a distinct feature of the estate, and the proposal would appear intrusive and overbearing in such a context, becoming unacceptably prominent within the street scene. The extension would provide a personal benefit to the appellant and his family, but the development and therefore the harms arising from it would continue to exist long after these personal circumstances have ceased to be relevant.
7. The use of materials to match the host building would maintain the visual harmony of the terrace, and the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2014) (SPD) advises that large extensions on corner plots can encroach over the building line on a highway frontage, thereby being particularly prominent in the street scene. In this case, the large, tall size of the extension with its long, unbroken lengths of the front and rear elevation walls and its long ridgeline, would result in No 2 dominating the host terrace and the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a permission for a two storey side extension at 20 Brookfield Walk, albeit limited details have been provided. Nevertheless, I saw at my site inspection that this is a detached property that is currently being extended. Although two storey the extension has a lower ridge height than the host thereby having a legible subservience, as well as being set away from the public footway. Given these differences, this property does not form a binding precedent for approving the appeal scheme.

9. For these reasons the extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, and the suggested conditions would not overcome this harm. The scheme would be contrary to Policy CS12 of the North Somerset Core Strategy (2017), Policies DM32 and DM38 of the North Somerset Development Management Policies (2016), and the supporting guidance in the SPD. Like the National Planning Policy Framework, these policies seek, amongst other things, high quality design that demonstrates sensitivity and enhances the local character and distinctiveness of an area, and that extensions respect the existing property as well as not causing harm to the street scene or local area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to an alternative scheme to extend the dwelling. However, this would be a matter for the relevant parties to consider separate to the appeal process and is not for me to consider.

Conclusion

11. The scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and to the area, and the suggested conditions would not overcome this harm. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no considerations that outweigh this conflict. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR