



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2024

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/24/3348577

88 Stockwood Road, Stockwood, Bristol, BS14 8JE

- 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 and Mrs Emma and Scott King against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01780/F.
 - The development proposed is Erection of an attached dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house on the corner of Stockwood Road and Selden Road. Most houses in the area are also semi-detached and similarly designed. On Stockwood Road there is a wide grass strip between the road and pavement and houses are set back from the pavement behind front gardens and driveways. Generally, houses have attached garages or side driveways leading to garages which create a significant gap between pairs of houses, particularly at first floor level, although in some cases side extensions have filled or reduced the gap. On corner plots, houses facing onto Stockwood Road have substantial side gardens, whereas houses opposite face onto adjoining roads with their rear gardens extending along Stockwood Road. These spaces between the road edge and house frontages, and gaps created by gardens on corner plots and in between houses elsewhere, contribute to the overall spacious suburban character of the area.
4. The proposed dwelling would be a 2 storey side extension. I note that the proposed development has sought to address the concerns raised by an Inspector in a previous appeal¹ by reducing the width of the property and removing a side porch, thus reducing the amount of garden space that would be affected. Nonetheless, it would significantly encroach into the side garden and thus erode the gap at the corner of the road that I have identified as

¹ APP/Z0116/W/23/3320525

important to the open character of the area and give rise to a cramped appearance.

5. Although the proposed development would not extend beyond the building line of houses on Selden Road, it would be closer to the pavement edge than other houses along the same side of the road which have deeper front gardens than the tapered garden that would be retained at the appeal site. The proposed development would therefore also undermine the open character and pattern of development in Selden Road and in this regard also fail to address the previous Inspector's concerns. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM21, DM26 and DM27 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) which seek development that respects the pattern and grain of development and does not harm the character of the street.

Planning Balance

6. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Consequently, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged. It requires that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
7. The proposal would provide benefits in terms of contributing towards the Council's housing land supply and providing jobs during construction, which weigh in favour of the development. In my view, the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Thus, the proposal would not be sustainable development for which the Framework indicates a presumption in favour.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to planning permission granted at 100 Stockwood Road and 1 Tibbott Walk. The former is on the next corner along from the appeal site, but its side garden is not as wide as that of the appeal site and as such contributes less to the open character of the area. The development of 1a Tibbott Walk is on the corner of a cul-de-sac with limited views of it such that its impact on the street scene is less than that of the appeal proposal. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR