



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

By G Powys Jones FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3352258

66 Kellaway Avenue, Henleaze, Bristol, BS6 7XU

- 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 & Mrs A & E Pallent against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01275/H.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and single storey rear extension to replace existing rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension and single storey rear extension to replace existing rear conservatory at 66 Kellaway Avenue, Henleaze, Bristol, BS6 7XU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01275/H, 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: 1100_KA100 A; 1100_KA101 A; 1100_KA200 A; 1100_KA201 A; 1100_KA210 A; 1100_KA211 A; 1100_KA250 A; 1100_KA300 A; 1100_KA301 A; 1100_KA302 A; 1100_KA303 A; 1100_KA400 A; 1100_KA401 A; 1100_KA402 A & 1100_KA403 A
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, a detached dwelling, is situated at the junction of King's Drive and Kellaway Avenue in a pleasant, predominantly residential area displaying a variety of house designs. To the west of the property and opposite, along Kellaway Avenue's frontages, the predominant built forms are semi-detached dwellings, whilst immediately to the rear, along King's Avenue western frontage, are detached dwellings. Playing fields are evident on the other side of King's Avenue from the appeal site, behind a hedged frontage.

4. The appeal property occupies a corner plot in a prominent position, particularly in views along King's Avenue. The extensions proposed in their totality are sizeable and would be widely seen. The side extension would take up most of the garden space between the property's eastern elevation and the highway and would breach the building line established by the detached properties to the south along the King's Avenue frontage. Having regard to the advice and guidance provided in its Supplementary Planning Document¹, these are factors which led the Council to conclude that the extensions proposed are too large and prominent, materially harming the openness currently in evidence at the junction.
5. I share the Council's view that this junction is notable for its openness. However, the main factors contributing to that perception lie outside the site. Firstly, are the open playing fields, which would remain the dominant feature contributing to openness; secondly, the relatively wide junction, made up not only of the highway carriageway and footways, but also a green verge and luxuriant hedge, which would be unaffected.
6. Whilst the proposed extensions are sizeable, I find them to be well designed, and they would integrate appropriately and tastefully with the form, appearance, and proportions of the host property. Accordingly, whilst the extensions would be widely seen, and would impinge on a side garden, what would be seen would sit acceptably in its visual and spatial contexts. Whilst the level of openness currently in evidence at the junction would be affected, the degree of change experienced would not be such as to prove harmful.
7. In conclusion, I find the development to an acceptable proposal compliant with those aspects of Core Strategy Policies BCS21 (Quality Urban Design, Local Plan Policies DM26 (Local Character and Distinctiveness), DM27 and DM30 directed to achieving good quality urban design contributing positively to local character and distinctiveness, particularly in residential extensions.

Conditions

8. In the interests of visual amenity, I shall impose a condition in respect of external materials. It is also necessary, in the interests of certainty, that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Other matters

9. All other matters raised have been taken into account, but no other matter is of such significance as to outweigh those considerations that led to my conclusions.
10. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 2 - A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions