



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2023

by Laura Cuthbert BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/23/3320429

2 Lower Chapel Lane, Frampton Cotterell, South Gloucestershire BS36 2RL

- 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 Nicola Kumi against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P22/06060/HH, dated 20 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is Single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Single storey front extension at 2 Lower Chapel Lane, Frampton Cotterell, South Gloucestershire BS36 2RL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P22/06060/HH, dated 20 October 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: -
 - Location Plan
 - Block/Site Plan
 - 036-101-A Existing Plans
 - 036-102-A Proposed Floor Plan
 - 036-103-A Proposed Elevations
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of the existing occupants of 4 Lower Chapel Lane, with respect to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site, 2 Lower Chapel Lane, consists of a semi-detached dwelling situated in a predominately residential area. The area consists of similar semi-detached properties, several of which have undergone extensions and

alterations, including a handful with small single storey front extensions. As a result, there is some irregularity in the character and rhythm of the streetscene and the building line. Notably, I do not consider that the symmetry of the semi-detached properties is a 'defined characteristic' of the area. No 2 also has an existing 2 storey side extension that sits flush with the front elevation, which already visually unbalances the pair of semi-detached dwellings.

4. The proposal, due to its small scale and appropriately designed form and massing, would allow the development to be read as a subservient addition to No 2. Furthermore, it would not span the whole width of the front elevation as alleged by the Council, as it would leave the 2 storey side extension untouched. Therefore, the proposal would not dominate over the existing dwelling. It would also be constructed of materials to match those used in the existing dwelling. These design features would further emphasise the acceptable design of the proposal and would result in the development representing a harmonious addition to the appeal property.
5. Whilst it would extend beyond the existing front elevation, given that there are other properties that have been extended to the front, there is not a uniformed building line along the streetscene. Furthermore, the proposal would be seen in the context of the building line associated with 86 Beesmoor Road to the south-west and its garage which is accessed off Lower Chapel Lane. The garage of No 86 sits on the shared boundary with No 2 and is positioned closer to the road than No 2. The proposal would not extend beyond the existing garage of No 86 and thus would not extend beyond this building line.
6. It is acknowledged that the South Gloucestershire Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) (adopted March 2021) states that front extensions would have the greatest impact on the public façade of the host dwelling. However, I have found that the design would be acceptable and that the proposal would not be incongruous to the existing character of No 2. Whilst the proposal would further visually unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, it is considered that given the variation that exists in the streetscene, this would not be materially harmful.
7. Therefore, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be in accordance with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (Local Plan) (adopted 2017), which together seek to ensure development achieves the highest standards of design and makes a positive contribution to the distinctiveness of the area. The development would also be in accordance with the SPD, which states that front extensions are unacceptable where it would upset the character and rhythm of the street scene. The proposal would also be in accordance with the principles within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seek good design sympathetic to the local area.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development would extend along the shared boundary with 4 Lower Chapel Lane, the attached property with No 2. At present, an established hedge runs along the shared front boundary. A window serving the front of No 4 is situated adjacent to the hedge.

9. The single storey height, scale and overall mass of the proposal would keep the impact of the development down to an acceptable level. The proposal would be prominent in the outlook from the front window of No 4 in the western direction. However, outlook and light in this direction are already restricted by the existing hedge. There would still be open views out towards the eastern side which would allow sufficient light to the front room of No 4. This open aspect to the east would also mean that the proposal would not have a significantly overbearing effect upon the outlook of the occupants of No 4. Consequently, the proposal would not have an enclosed or oppressive effect on the outlook currently enjoyed by No 4 nor would the proposal reduce the light reaching the front room of No 4 down to an unacceptable level.
10. Therefore, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the existing occupants of 4 Lower Chapel Lane, with respect to outlook and daylight. It would be in accordance with Policies PSP8 and PSP38 of the Local Plan which, in combination, require development to not create unacceptable living conditions or have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of occupiers of nearby properties, including overbearing and dominant impact and loss of light. It would also be in accordance with the SPD which states that rooms of primary living accommodation should not have an enclosed or oppressive outlook and should have sufficient natural light to allow the room to be comfortably used.

Conditions

11. As well as the standard time condition, conditions have been imposed to set out the approved plans in the interests of certainty and require the use of matching materials in the interests of a good quality external appearance.

Conclusion

12. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan and as such the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Laura Cuthbert

INSPECTOR