



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3336971

7 Manor Lane, Charfield, South Gloucestershire, GL12 8TB

- 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 Sarah Parker against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P23/02580/HH, dated 9 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey extension to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey extension to front of property at 7 Manor Lane, Charfield, South Gloucestershire, GL12 8TB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P23/02580/HH, dated 9 September 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: Location Plan, Site Location Plan (D1), Existing Elevations (D3a), Floorplan Existing (D4a), Existing Site Sections (D5a), Block Plan Parking Standards (D2-C), Proposed Elevations (D3a), Floorplan Proposed (D4a), and Proposed Site Sections (D5a).
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling at one end of a short terrace of three (Nos 7, 9 and 11) and sits on the inside of a sweeping curve in the road, close to the terminal end of a residential cul-de-sac limb of Manor Lane. The property has an existing, two-storey gabled extension to the rear. The proposal would add a two-storey gabled extension to the front, spanning

- approximately half the width of the dwelling. This would include relocation of the main entrance door to the building's side elevation.
4. The Council points to the area's mix of property sizes, styles, and finishes, which I saw for myself. However, I do not recognise the '*strong sense of uniformity*' which is purported to exist for the terrace. Whilst there is uniformity between the architectural detail of each property, the terrace as a whole is neither symmetrical in appearance nor part of a regimented street scene. Each of the dwellings has an off-centre gablet over a first-floor window, but as No 7 is a mirror image of No 11 at the opposite end of the terrace, these features are not evenly spaced along the total span of the roof. Furthermore, the dwellings have alternative looking porch canopies, and replacement windows have altered the original fenestration pattern. Moreover, the terrace sits as a singular group along this side of the cul-de-sac beyond its turn and is part of the area's wider mixed character. In my assessment, the limited degree of uniformity for the terrace is not significant. Neither does it make the appeal property overly sensitive to change.
 5. The proposed extension would remodel the appearance of No 7 and the terrace as a whole. However, it would match the existing building in terms of style, materials, and detailing. Although the dwelling is exposed to view from the front and side, due to its siting and the plot's openness, I find the composition of its remodelled appearance overall would be well-considered in terms of proportions, scale and form, with the front extension appearing as a seamless addition which would merely alter the arrangement of the existing building. The main entrance to the side elevation would still be positioned on a principal elevation facing the road due to the dwelling's corner location. This would not be incongruous. The appearance of the terrace would undeniably change, but I am unable to identify any harm from the visual imbalance which would arise, which in any case is not unprecedented within the cul-de-sac. No 31 Manor Lane opposite, and on the outside of the road's bend, projects forward and at right angles to the otherwise linear terrace of which it forms part. This is not dissimilar to the appeal proposal and appears neither incongruous nor out of keeping.
 6. The Council references the building lines within the street scene and are concerned that the forward projection of No 7 would be disruptive and harmful to the existing levels of openness. Whilst the terrace currently has a straight facade, it does not follow the alignment of the highway. The terrace is set on a splay. The end front corner of No 11 is considerably closer to the back of the pavement along Manor Lane than the opposing front corner of No 7. Notwithstanding the proposed forward extension of No 7, the appeal property would retain a front garden depth of almost 8m. This would compare favourably with others to this side of the road and would far exceed the depths of frontages to properties opposite. There would be some inevitable erosion of space immediately to the front of No 7 but given the sweeping nature of the bend in the road, the overall spacious qualities of this corner location would be largely unaffected.
 7. The Council's *Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2021* (SPD) deals with front extensions at section 2.4. Although it points out that they are largely unacceptable, particularly at two-storey, they are not discounted. The SPD adds that the most important consideration is the likely

impact on the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and the impact on the character of the surrounding area.

8. The SPD lists five design principles that all front extensions should adhere to. For the reasons given I find the front extension would not be incongruous with the character of the host building. It would not span the width of the front elevation and neither do I find that it would unacceptably unbalance an existing façade. It would not project beyond the front plane of any existing features on the terrace and would be appropriately set back from the front boundary with the street scene. Clear views of a front entrance door from the street would be retained and I am not persuaded that the neighbour's entrance at No 9 would be unacceptably screened. There would therefore be no conflict with the SPD's design principles for front extensions.
9. Neither do I find any conflict with the SPD's general design guide principles as far as they seek to ensure householder development proposals address the key requirements regarding residential amenity and design that are set out within the development plan, particularly Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan 2017 and Core Strategy 2006 – 2027 Policy CS1. It follows that the proposal would display the design quality required by Policies PSP38 and CS1 to ensure development responds positively to the context and local distinctiveness of the area. As such, I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed and beautiful places.

Conditions

10. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area, a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials that would match the existing.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of No 7 or the wider area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR