



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2023

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27.11.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/23/3328586

28 Langhill Avenue, Bristol, BS4 1TN

- 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 Karl Jones against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/05388/H, dated 08 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, associated works and replacement porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension, associated works and replacement porch at 28 Langhill Avenue, Bristol, BS4 1TN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/05388/H, dated 08 November 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. Notwithstanding the roofing materials shown on drawing 2591/22 Proposed Elevations, all new external work and finishes and work of making good shall match existing original work adjacent in respect of materials used, detailed execution and finished appearance.
 3. Excepting the roofing works noted in Condition 2 above, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, Existing block plan, Proposed block plan (as submitted to the Council on 20 April 2023), 2591/22 - Existing floor plan & elevations, 2591/22 - Existing ground floor plan, 2591/22 - Proposed elevations (as submitted to the Council on 17 July 2023), 2591/22 - Proposed first floor plan (as submitted to the Council on 18 April 2023) and 2591/22 - Proposed ground floor plan (as submitted to the Council on 18 April 2023)

Preliminary Matter

2. The Appellant has identified that amended plans were submitted during the determination period of the planning application and it is these plans which I shall consider.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached, hipped-roof dwelling on a generous triangular style plot set on the inside of a curve in Langhill Avenue. The locality is an established residential estate with semi-detached and terraced homes of broadly similar design and scale. Corner plots tend to have space to their sides although a number of extensions have reduced this in places. The appeal property, because of the road curve, has some of the characteristics of a corner plot without being at a road junction. Most dwellings are brick finish but the appeal property differs from this and its paired partner because it is a rendered painted finish. The streetscene is a pleasant one with an unremarkable combination of solidly designed estate dwellings, their gardens and generous road widths. The proposal is as described above.
5. The Council is, in brief, concerned that the extension would be over-sized, unduly prominent and incongruous.
6. I fully understand that very marked subservience is generally the key to a successful side extension but this is an unusual situation. The forward projecting gable front to the outer edge of the existing property would deliver some subservience to the planned set-back side extension. The lower roof line would appreciably add to this. Whilst width of the extension relative to the host property may well be more than the Council's 'general 50% guide' it is evident that the open ground to the side of this home is also greater than the norm. I am not persuaded that this openness, which is not on a corner, contributes in any positive way to the streetscene or the character of the area.
7. The visual symmetry of the semi-detached pair has been lost already to a degree by external finishes but even with this, and an extension, the front projecting gables will stand dominant as a legible pair. There are a few properties locally of the final sized proposed, and also terraced runs, and in my opinion implementation of the scheme proposed here would not be jarring on the eye
8. In all the circumstances I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would preserve the aesthetic qualities of the host property, the semi-detached pairing and the locality.
9. Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) have relevance to the case. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek scheme with good quality design, of suitable scale and form, which respect the character of the host building, street scene and urban grain. This is reflected in the objectives of the SPD2 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (October 2005), albeit this document cannot be expected by way of detailed example or statement to cover every eventuality. Given the nature of the scheme before me I conclude that the

proposal would not conflict with the relevant development plan policies or the pertinent visual aims of the SPD.

Conditions

10.I consider that the standard commencement condition should be applied. I agree with the Council that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty. The Council rightly identifies that roofing needs specific control and I shall deal with this as suggested in the interests of visual amenity.

Overall conclusion

11.For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR