



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3357899

11 Severn View Road, Thornbury, South Gloucestershire, BS35 1AY

- 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 R Cullen against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02004/HH.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Subsequent to the refusal of permission for the proposed development the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2024. Further minor amendments were published on 7 February 2025, containing corrections and a clarification. The wording of the relevant paragraphs of the new Framework are similar to that of the 2023 version. Therefore, it has not been necessary to seek comments from the parties on the revised Framework, which I have referred to in my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey semi-detached house. It is one of a group of 4 similarly designed pairs of houses along Severn View Road and on Eastland Avenue near its junction with Severn View Road. The houses have flat roofed single storey projections across their frontage that wrap around to the side. The side element on the appeal property has been converted into a garage and there is a front porch extension so that it differs slightly from the adjoining house, No 10, but otherwise they share a symmetry that contributes to their appearance and that of the street scene.
5. The council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (SPD) requires side extensions to be set down below the roof ridge and set back behind the building line so that an extension is subservient, and the original form of the host building is retained. The proposed side extension would have the same ridge height and maintain the first floor building line at the front of the house,

rather than being set back behind it. Consequently, instead of being a subservient addition, the proposed development would widen the existing frontage without the original form of the host dwelling being discernible and would thus appear out of balance with the adjoining house.

6. Given the location of the appeal site, on a bend in the road, where it is highly visible, the loss of symmetry and balance between the semi-detached pair of houses would be particularly apparent and harmful to the appearance of both dwellings and the street scene.
7. Other elements of the proposal are less harmful, either because they are at the rear of the appeal property and not visible from public viewpoints or, in the case of the proposal to replace the flat roof on the front projection with a single pitched roof, there are other examples on nearby houses and enough design variation within the area that it would not appear too incongruous. Nonetheless, these elements are integrated with the side extension which I have found would be unacceptable.
8. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013), Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017), the SPD and the Framework which only permits development of a high quality design that enhances local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions within the area. No 11 North Road was for a separate dwelling attached to an existing property, rather than a side extension to it, and is therefore not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. The development at No 16 Severn View does not include a side extension and the extensions at Nos 8, and 13 Severn View, which was not implemented, were consented before the adoption of the SPD. 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

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR