



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

by Stephen Hawkins MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/C/23/3333576

42 Stoneleigh Drive, Barrs Court, Bristol BS30 7BZ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The appeal is made by Mrs Adria Hudd against an enforcement notice issued by South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The notice was issued on 2 November 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the erection of a single storey extension.
 - The requirements of the notice are to permanently remove the extension and its constituent parts from the land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is one month.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) & (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the development already carried out, namely the erection of a single storey extension on land at 42 Stoneleigh Drive, Barrs Court, Bristol BS30 7BZ referred to in the notice.

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published on 19 December 2023 has been taken into account in my Decision.

Ground (a) appeal

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this ground of appeal is the effect of the single storey extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings. It is located at the far end of a residential cul-de-sac, on part of a planned modern estate largely made up of detached and semi-detached properties which exhibit significant similarities in terms of their architectural style. The properties are generally finished externally with brickwork and tiles of differing shades. As with the dwelling, a number of properties have contrasting render panels with brick surrounds, or else render and half-timbering, on parts of their

principal elevations. The variation in external finishes imparts additional visual interest to the pleasant if otherwise unremarkable suburban character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. The enforcement notice attacks a single storey extension. The extension occupies part of the space between the side elevation of the dwelling and the boundary at the side of the property, also protruding slightly beyond the rear elevation. Having a rectangular footprint perhaps less than a third of that of the dwelling and incorporating a shallow angled pitched roof, the extension is of modest proportions. There is little in the simple form or elevational design of the extension that is significantly at odds with the established characteristics of the dwelling and its surroundings.
6. The extension is set well back from the principal elevation of the dwelling, behind the front garden and parking spaces, at a significant distance from the street. On the approach to the property, the extension is viewed as a small-scale, subsidiary addition to the side and rear of the dwelling, only slightly taller than the adjacent boundary fencing, in a context which includes incidental outbuildings of substantial size at neighbouring properties. As a result, the extension has a limited visual presence and it is not perceived as an especially conspicuous built feature in the surroundings.
7. The extension has dark brown coloured timber cladding on the external walls, with a felt roof covering. The external finishes do not necessarily have to match those of the dwelling to successfully assimilate the extension within its setting. Timber cladding is often used on buildings to complement other external materials including brickwork and render. Dark coloured timber makes a significant visual contribution to the palette of external materials evident in the locality. The cladding contrasts with the external finishes of the dwelling, but not jarringly so. Rather, the cladding is complementary to those finishes, its dark colour also contributing to the visually recessive qualities of the extension.
8. Furthermore, the cladding is reflective of the secondary or ancillary function of the extension in relation to the dwelling. Besides, the finished colour of the cladding is similar to that of the external doors, window frames and rainwater goods of the dwelling and neighbouring residential properties. Alongside those built of masonry, some of the other extensions as well as residential outbuildings in the vicinity incorporate comparable external finishes. Consequently, the external materials relate positively to the dwelling and the surroundings, helping to integrate the extension visually with the dwelling and within the prevailing pattern of local development.
9. For the above reasons, the extension is not viewed as an alien addition to the dwelling, either in terms of its design, external materials or overall appearance. There is no harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area, the extension being in accordance with criterion in Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy, as the siting, form, scale, colour and materials are informed by, respect and enhance the character, distinctiveness and amenity of the site and its context. The extension also accords with Policy PSP1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies Sites and Places Plan (LP), as there is an understanding of and a constructive response to the buildings and characteristics that contribute positively to local distinctiveness. Furthermore, the extension accords with

criterion in LP Policy PSP38 as it respects the form, scale, proportions, architectural style and external materials of the street and surrounding area.

Conditions

10. The Council did not suggest any conditions to be attached in the event of planning permission being granted for the extension. In my view, no conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

11. The extension does not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area and accords with the Development Plan, taken as a whole. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal should succeed on ground (a) and planning permission will be granted. The appeal on ground (g) does not therefore need to be considered.

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR