



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/23/3330016

142 Fishponds Road, Eastville, Bristol BS5 6PT

- 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 A Shah against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05360/H, dated 22 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension at 142 Fishponds Road, Eastville, Bristol BS5 6PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/05360/H, dated 22 July 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 2401- Location, 2401-Block, 2401-08, 2401-05, 2401-07.
 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 Government published in December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Given the similarities with the previous Framework with regards to matters of character and appearance, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by not making representations on this matter.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a substantial two storey detached property, set above Fishponds Road, a lengthy road, which, nearby the appeal site is characterised by a mix of terrace, semi-detached and detached dwellings and some commercial units. Extensive additions are visible to the rear of the nearby properties, including two storey projections of varying depths.

5. The appeal property is finished in a mix of stone and render and has previously been extended to the rear through a conservatory and two storey projection. The property also has a single storey side projection.
6. The proposed extension would replace the existing conservatory and would not increase the footprint of the property. Nonetheless, the proposed extension would add massing at first floor level. However, there would remain a clear separation between the new extension and the existing two storey rear projection, which would break up its bulk. Given the significant scale of the existing property and the limited depth of the proposed extension, it would not overwhelm or dominate the existing dwelling nor prevent appreciation of its original form, even in combination with previous additions. The proposed use of render would match that of the existing rear two storey rear projection and would not therefore appear incongruous. The original stone finish of the property would remain evident on the frontage.
7. Given its siting, the proposed extension would compromise the outlook and light reaching the first floor side facing windows of the existing rear projection, however, the single room these windows serve also benefits from a rear facing window, which ensures that acceptable light and outlook would be retained.
8. As such, the extension would not appear insensitive to the character and appearance of the existing property. It would also not appear incongruous nor out of place with the mixed character of the surrounding dwellings.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore find that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling nor surrounding area. There is therefore no conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011), and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014), insofar as these collectively seek to ensure that development is not harmful and contributes positively to an areas character and identity. There is also no conflict with the design advice set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (2005).

Conditions

10. Suggested conditions has been provided that the Council. I have considered these in light of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
11. In addition to the standard time limit condition and compliance with the application plans, a condition relating to the materials of the external surfaces matching the existing property is appropriate, in the interest of its character and appearance and that of the surroundings.

Conclusion

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR