



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/23/3321277

1 Abbeydale, Winterbourne, South Gloucestershire, BS36 1LW

- 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 P Capper against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P22/06245/HH, dated 31 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey extension to the side and front elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow occupying a corner plot within a residential neighbourhood. Together with a similar property at No 3, it fronts onto Abbeydale and faces a footpath adjacent to a swathe of green open space where the road sweeps in a curve leading to its junction with St Francis Drive. The proposal would project the form of the original property sideways with a wrap-around addition to the front that would extend forwards with a gabled projection.
4. The appeal property broadly resembles the form of the semi-detached bungalows that line both sides of St Francis Drive and which display a degree of rhythm and cohesion derived from their reasonably consistent appearances and use of materials, their open plan frontages with regimented forward building lines, and their uniform separation distances. Together with No 3, the appeal property closely associates itself with, and maintains the rhythm and cohesion of, the dwellings along St Francis Drive when turning the corner and moving into Abbeydale.
5. In isolation, I agree with the appellant that the extension would integrate well with the existing dwelling, appearing as a carefully considered and proportionate adjunct, with detailing and materials to match. However, although the forward projection would be fairly modest, measuring just 1.5m,

there would be a noticeable change to the appearance and alignment of the dwelling. The front gable would be a prominent feature that would stand proud of the orchestrated alignment of Nos 1 and 3, interrupting the otherwise regimented character of the immediate area in an intrusive manner. In this regard the extension would appear incongruous and out of keeping. The reduced spacing between Nos 1 and 3 as a result of the sideways extension of the appeal property would further disrupt the established rhythm and spacious qualities of the street scene.

6. I have noted the alternative form of some other properties along Abbeydale, but for the most part I was struck by the continuity of repeat building types and their regimentation within the street scene, which I found to be representative of, and consistent with, the wider area's local distinctiveness.
7. I appreciate that the proposal would provide additional living space that is needed by the appellant. I also note that the Parish Council raised no objection. But these factors do not alter my findings as they relate to the merits of the case.

Conclusions

8. By disrupting the character and rhythm of the street scene, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with the design principles for front extensions contained within the Council's *Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* adopted in 2021, and criterion 1 of Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted November 2017). For the same reasons it would also fail to achieve the high quality of design that is required by Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006 - 2027 and the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.
9. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR