



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by K Jones BA (Hons) DipLA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/23/3327348

11 Somerby Close, Bradley Stoke, South Gloucestershire BS32 8EG

- 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 Rajendra Manchikalapati against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P23/01651/HH, dated 18 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension to form garage and additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension to form garage and additional living accommodation at 11 Somerby Close, Bradley Stoke, South Gloucestershire BS32 8EG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P23/01651/HH, dated 18 May 2023, 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: PL-01 – Site Location and Site Plans; and PL-04 – Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from Council's decision notice because the appeal scheme involves the demolition of most, if not all, of the existing garage and is therefore more accurate than that given on the application form. I have therefore 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 area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the urban residential area of Bradley Stoke. Somerby Close comprises a split cul-de-sac of predominantly detached properties alongside a small number of short terraces. As a relatively modern area of housing, there are a variety of building styles, materials and

configurations, which are positioned in an informal orientation around the short lengths of road. The appeal property forms a coherent part of this varied character when seen from the surrounding area, as a large, detached dwelling with a unique design and orientation.

5. The proposed development would introduce a two-storey extension in place of the existing single-storey garage. The materials and window detailing would match those of the existing dwelling. The Council has indicated that the proposed hipped-roof profile of the extension would be uncharacteristic of the property and the street scene. Even though there is no strong character of hipped-roof extensions in the immediate site area, there are a variety of roof forms within the differing building styles, along with many and varied extensions. A number of the garages locally also present hipped-roofs, including the garage to be demolished. The proposed roofline would therefore form a consistent part of the varied roofscape of the area, as seen in both the immediate street scene and in wider views from the south, and would appropriately integrate with the existing property.
6. I note that within the South Gloucestershire Council Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (the SPD), additional guidance on subservience of side extensions is provided. The proposal would be set down and back from the principle building elevation, and would maintain subservience in this regard. Whilst the proposed extension would be more than half the width of the original front elevation of the property, the extension would not extend beyond the width of the existing garage. In addition, the previous two-storey extension to the west of the property reads as a coherent and integral part of the main building, resulting in a wider existing front elevation. Within this context, the proposed development would not appear to be unduly large or dominate the front façade.
7. The single storey rear extension would be positioned within the rear garden of the property, and would have a limited effect on the street scene or in other views of the building. Overall therefore, whilst the proposed development would form a new visible element of the street scene, in this varied context, and with numerous substantial detached properties in this area, the appeal property as proposed would not be disproportionately large, dominant, or uncharacteristic of the area.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy (2013), and Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017). Taken together, these policies require, amongst other things, high quality design that is informed by, respects and enhances the character, distinctiveness and amenity of both the site and its context, respecting the form, scale, proportions, architectural style/detailing and external materials of the street and surrounding area. I also find that the scheme would accord with the guidance as set out in the SPD and the aims of the Framework.

Conditions

9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans in the interests of

certainty. I have also attached a condition requiring the use of matching materials in the interests of attaining an acceptable appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I find that the proposals would comply with the development plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations that carry sufficient weight to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Jones

INSPECTOR