



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3353091

50 Cave Grove, Emersons Green, South Gloucestershire BS16 7BR

- 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 Jacob Garraway against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/01616/HH.
 - The development proposed is a proposed first storey rear and side extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed first storey rear and side extension and loft conversion at 50 Cave Grove, Emersons Green, South Gloucestershire BS16 7BR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P24/01616/HH, 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 1:1250 scale Site Location Plan, and drawing No's 001 Rev A and 002 Rev A.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The scheme proposes a first-floor side and rear extension, as well as a dormer window to the front roof slope, in order to facilitate the conversion of the loft space. The side extension would sit above a previously constructed extension to the property which has a curved front wall with high level windows. It would appear as a small, subservient feature above the existing extension. While it would not replicate the design ethos of the curved extension, it would relate well to the detailing and form of the remainder of the dwelling. Given its siting above and set back from the front extent of the existing extension, together with its small scale, it would not appear as an incongruous or disproportionate addition.
4. The proposed dormer would sit within the front roof slope and be set in from the end of the roof, set up from the eaves and set down from the ridge. As a result, it would not dominate the roof of the dwelling. The structure of the

dormer would be wider than the glazing of the window, however given the horizontal emphasis to the windows to the ground and first floor below, in the context with which the dormer would be viewed, it would not appear as excessively wide. I note comments from the Council that there are no other dormers present within the immediate vicinity, however they are present in the wider residential development and as such are not alien features within the setting of the dwelling. As such, the dormer would sit appropriately within the roofscape and would integrate acceptably with the host property and its surroundings.

5. There is reference to there being brick detailing to the existing front gable to the property, as well as neighbouring properties. While this detailing is not replicated in the proposed dormer, given that it would be a more subservient feature of the front elevation, the plainer detailing is an acceptable design choice.
6. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Thus, it accords with policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (Adopted 2017), as well as policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (Adopted 2013). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is acceptable in terms of its design and delivers a high-quality design.

Other Matters

7. The Council's reasons for refusal refer to policy PSP39 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan. However, this policy refers to residential conversions, sub-divisions, and houses in multiple occupation. None of these are proposed and as such this policy has no bearing on the appeal.

Conditions

8. In the interests of clarity, I have imposed a condition stipulating the approved plans. The Council has suggested a condition requiring that matching materials be used. However, as the application form states that materials would match, this condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR