



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/23/3335779

37 Glenavon Park, Bristol, Sneyd Park, BS9 1RW

- 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 & Mrs Li against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/06008/H, dated 20 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is proposed side infill single storey extension, front porch, roof replacement including raising the height and external alterations to fenestration (including velux windows), rear doors and dormer roof extensions (revision of consent granted 22/02387/h).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed side infill single storey extension, front porch, roof replacement including raising the height and external alterations to fenestration (including velux windows), rear doors and dormer roof extensions (revision of consent granted 22/02387/h) at 37 Glenavon Park, Bristol, Sneyd Park, BS9 1RW in accordance with the terms of the application, 22/06008/H, dated 20 December 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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: S201; P201; P210; P211; P212 and P213.
 - 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.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Li against Bristol City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Sneyd Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. Houses in the CA are generally large, detached, and set back from the road behind substantial landscaped front gardens, usually with high hedges and mature trees along their front boundary. This often restricts views of them from the street. House designs vary with some arts and crafts housing characterised by tall chimneys, exposed brick and wooden beams and large roofs with eaves down to the first floor. Others are more typical of interwar suburban housing. Dormer windows are visible on the side, front and rear of some houses within the CA. The area appears spacious and green and more reminiscent of a village than part of a city, which contributes to its historic significance, along with the different styles of houses.
6. Glenavon Park is a relatively modern housing estate built in the 1980s, according to the Council. It comprises a circular estate road with housing facing inwards, away from the wider Conservation Area to the south and east of it, to which it is connected by feeder roads. Houses are predominantly detached and set back from tarmac footways behind driveways and landscaped gardens without boundary walls. This gives the estate a more open plan character than elsewhere in the CA, although it retains a verdant appearance. House designs, orientation and materials vary such that there is no definitive architectural style within the estate and house designs do not generally reflect the architectural style of houses elsewhere within the CA.
7. The appeal property is a 2 storey detached house. It sits behind an attached double garage which fronts onto a driveway and front garden. Due to the informal layout in this section of the estate there is no common building line. Neighbouring houses sit forward of the house on one side and back from it on the other, and the land slopes down away from the road such that roof lines and heights vary. As noted by the Council, the appeal property has no historic character or design.
8. The proposal is described as a revision of a previous application, 22/02387/h, which was approved by the Council. According to the appellant, the only difference between the applications is the addition of rear dormers in the appeal proposal. The Council has expressed no concern over the proposed side extension and front porch. Both are subservient to the main house and integrate well with it and in my view are acceptable. Its concern is over the proposal to raise the roof ridge and chimney by almost 1m and add 2 dormers to the rear roof slope. The eaves height would remain the same, retaining the relationship between first floor windows which on most houses within the estate are immediately below the eaves, although the roof pitch would be steeper than is currently the case. Nonetheless, given the variety of roof heights, the extension would easily be absorbed within the streetscape without appearing out of place. This was also the Council's view expressed in the Officer Report on the previous planning application.
9. The proposed rear dormers would be set down from the roof ridge, in from the sides of the roof, and up from the eaves. The window widths would match that of a first floor window with one of the dormers positioned above it. The dormers would appear subservient and be clad in hanging tiles matching that of the main

roof. As illustrated in the appellant's appeal statement, they would meet the requirements set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 - A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005) (SPD).

10. The rear of some houses within the estate are visible from the road and although I saw no dormers on these properties, the rear of the appeal property cannot be seen from the street or wider CA. In any case, I do not consider that they would harm the appearance of the host property, or affect the open green character of the CA. The proposed development would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the Sneyd Park Conservation Area.
11. Overall, I consider the proposed development would accord with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Local Plan Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27, and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) and the SPD which require high quality design that respects the overall design and character of the host building and wider area.

Other matters

12. I have had regard to representations raising concerns in relation to overshadowing and loss of privacy to neighbouring houses. Although the infill side extension would be close to the boundary with No 39, overshadowing would not be significantly greater than that caused by the existing rear extension. Views from the rear dormers towards No 39's garden would be limited to part of the garden furthest from the house because of the angle of view from the windows, which sit forward of the rear of No 39 and to the side. I agree with the Council that the loss of privacy to the occupiers of No 39 would not therefore be significant. Nor would the privacy of occupiers of 4 Newcombe Drive be affected to a harmful degree as the potential for overlooking would not be greater than for the existing windows on the host property, which exceed the minimum distance between neighbouring windows set out in the SPD.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans to provide certainty and imposed a condition regarding materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR