



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3343847

30 Honey Garston Road, Hartcliffe, Bristol, BS13 9LT

- 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 Nathan Proud against Bristol City Council.
 - The application is Ref 23/03800/H.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling which stands, on a corner plot, at the junction of Honey Garston Road and Herridge Road. At the time of my site visit, works appeared to be taking place to the host dwelling and the location for the proposed extension appeared to have been fenced off from the remainder of the site. The appeal site is located in a visually prominent location within the street scene with all elevations being visible from both Honey Garston Road and Herridge Road, respectively. The terraced row, which the appeal site is part of, is grouped in pairs and stepped down, between each pair, due to the general topography of the site. As a result of the estate's layout, the appeal site appears to occupy a larger than usual plot which I find is a characteristic of properties in such locations where Honey Garston Road meets with other roads within the vicinity.
4. At the time of my site visit I found that development along Honey Garston Road, and the adjoining streets, appears to have been designed maintaining strong building lines with corners generally relatively free of development. Lack of development, on the corner plots generally introduces an element of spaciousness into the street scene to avoid visual over development within the estate. At the time of my site visit I found that the limited level of development, the plot size, and open nature of the corner plot in question, to be a characteristic feature of junctions along Honey Garston Road.
5. The Council's refusal reason is specific being based upon the proposed extension's design, scale, and massing within the side garden to the appeal site adding uncharacteristic bulk to the corner plot in an area where development is generally set back at junctions in order to create openness within the street

scene. The appellant has raised, within their statement of case, seven other sites which are accompanied by a photograph for each site. Five of the examples provided, by the appellant, are on Murford Avenue which is the road which runs parallel to Honey Garston Road linked by both Meriet Avenue and Herridge Road. Whilst I acknowledge those examples, limited evidence has been provided, such as circumstances behind any planning permission granted, other than an image of each site, respectively and in any case, they are not part of the street scene of Honey Garston Road. The two other examples are, however, include 16 and 18 Honey Garston Road (no. 16 and no. 18), respectively.

6. No. 16 benefits from a single storey extension which does project beyond the building line of Meriet Avenue. Despite this the single storey nature is not comparable to the appeal proposal before me and it still allows clear views over and around the junction, as well as between properties, which I find limits impact upon the openness of the corner plot in question by comparison. No. 18 is immediately opposite on the junction with Meriet Avenue. I find that the development at no. 18, is an example of why such levels of built form should not be supported in corner locations due to the impact it has on the openness around the junctions. I have no further information such as, for example, when or if planning permission was granted for the built form in question to understand the reasoning behind the decision made on that site or indeed the timings of any decision in the context of the relevant Local Plan or material considerations. I acknowledge the examples along Honey Garston Road itself, but I find that one is not comparable to the appeal proposal that is before me, and the other is a negative example of the impact to a corner junction such levels of development can have.
7. The building line for the side of Herridge Road would be breached by the proposals, significantly, and due to the site levels in the area immediately around the appeal site, I find that the proposed development would be elevated above the footway which would ultimately result in a prominent, intrusive, development, which would materially impact upon the sense of openness around the road junction. I find that the proposal would fail to respect the established layout and building lines of the area would result in significant harm to the appearance and character of the area. Whilst I acknowledge the examples of corner plot development, along Honey Garston Road, I find that the example of two storey development appears to be a one off and not development which I consider to be characteristic for the area. The adverse impact of this proposal is clearly demonstrated as something which I find should be avoided along other junctions within the vicinity.
8. The principle of development on corner plots is not necessarily disputed, however, such plots are always more sensitive due to their visual prominence within multiple street scenes as well as, in most cases, the intentional design with regard to spacing to the side of such dwellings. For proposals to be successful in such locations it is key that they are both sympathetic to the host dwelling itself, surrounding building lines as well as the visual implications which would arise from development and, in this case, I do not feel that the proposal would be sympathetic but instead would result in prominent and intrusive development resulting in over development of the site in question.
9. The proposal would be contrary to Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 Policy BCS21 which expects development to contribute positively

to an areas character and identity. The proposal would also be contrary to Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 (LP) Policy DM27 which outlines that the layout, form, pattern and arrangements of streets should contribute to the creation of high quality urban design and LP Policy DM30 which requires that extensions and alterations to existing buildings respects the siting, scale, form, proportions and the overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.

10. The proposal would also be contrary to the provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, paragraph 135, which seek to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment, as well as maintaining a strong sense of place, using the arrangements of streets, places, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has raised that the proposal is in accordance with SPD2 (A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations) October 2005 insofar as the proposal is subordinate in design. I would, however, clarify that the SPD is in itself guidance, not policy, and in any case, it does not form part of the Council's refusal reason, which is before me which means, therefore, I do not have a copy of the document referred to by the appellant before me in order to consider the proposal against such guidance. In any case, the refusal reason is not based upon the proposals relationship with the host dwelling, but is instead, specific to the impact of the proposals in terms of harm to the appearance and character of the area.
12. I note that the appellant outlines that no further communication occurred, from the Council, until the application was refused, however, the handling of the application is outside of the scope of this appeal (which is not accompanied by an application for costs) and I have considered the proposal on its own merits based upon the evidence before me as well as my observations at the time of my site visit.
13. Whilst the Council's delegated report states that neighbouring properties have been consulted and no comments were received, I can see that there were two objections to the proposals before me relating to highways and parking and invasion as to privacy. I note, from the planning history, that previous applications have been for flats/a dwelling in this location but the proposal before me a two-storey side and rear extension to the existing dwelling and I must consider proposals as they are before me on their own merits and on the basis on which they are submitted. Comments regarding the construction of walls are noted, however, such elements are not included within the appeal proposal before me.
14. The Council have considered residential amenity within their assessment and, from the evidence before me and my site visit, I have no reason to conclude differently taking into account the proposed built form and location of windows within the proposals. The plans before me do not demonstrate parking provision for what would be four-bedroom dwelling (compared to a two-bedroom dwelling at present) and the Council do not appear to have assessed this. Despite this the site appears to be in an accessible location and, at the time of my site visit, there was plenty of on-street parking available. Whilst I appreciate that this is only a snapshot in time, I do not have any evidence to

conclude differently in relation to parking or highway safety on the basis of an extension.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR