



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2024

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3340664

8 Rathbone Close, Coalpit Heath, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS36 2TN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Karam Bahssali against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P23/03163/F.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension to include raising of the roofline to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raising of the roof line to facilitate the erection of ground and first floor rear extensions to form additional living accommodation at 8 Rathbone Close, Coalpit Heath, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS36 2TN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P23/03163/F, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than [three] years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos R-08-01 Rev B, R-08-02 Rev B, R-08-03 Rev B, R-08-04 Rev B, R-08-05 Rev A, R-08-06 Rev B and R-08-07 Rev A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the planning application form. In my formal decision, I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice as this includes the ground floor extension and is a more accurate description of the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modest semi-detached bungalow located within a residential cul-de-sac of similar pairs of properties. There is some consistency in the pattern and design of development along the road although with several properties having been extended there is noticeable variation in the size and appearance of the properties, particularly at roof level and to the rear. These

alterations are visible from the street and form part of the overall character along the road.

5. The proposal is for a two-storey rear extension with a pitched roof and rear facing gable. The apex of the extension would be higher than the existing ridgeline by approximately 1 metre. This would require the ridge of the main roof to be raised and the roof slope extended across a small section reaching its apex where it would meet the ridge of the proposed extensions.
6. This alteration to the front roof slope and the sizeable rear extension with its enlarged west facing elevation would be visible from the street. The proposal would increase the overall scale and bulk of the building. In this regard, the scheme would not accord with the advice set out within the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document adopted March 2021 (the SPD) which advises rear extensions should be subservient and set down from the ridge of the main roof. Whilst relatively large, the extension would effectively integrate with the property as I observed to be the case with similarly extended properties at Numbers 14 and 31 Rathbone Close. As such it would not be an unduly dominant or incongruous addition to the host property despite not being in full accordance with the SPD guidance.
7. In the context of the nearby developments at Nos 14 and 31 and the other varied roof forms arising from extended properties within the locality, the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene.
8. This leads me to conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of both the host property and the area. It would therefore comply with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy adopted December 2013; Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan adopted November 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together and amongst other things, these seek development proposals of a high quality design, which respond to and make a positive contribution to the distinctiveness of a place and respect the building form of the street and surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR