



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2024 by T Mansfield

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3348083

105 Queensdown Gardens, Brislington, Bristol BS4 3JE

- 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 Michael Luke against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01790/H.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension of garage to meet the front line of the porch. New pitched roof on porch and garage to allow for garage conversion to create home office / playroom and utility.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension of garage to meet the front line of the porch. New pitched roof on porch and garage to allow for garage conversion to create home office / playroom and utility at 105 Queensdown Gardens, Brislington, Bristol, BS4 3JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01790/H, 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 external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing number 2228/-03 Rev-P3.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property belongs to a small group of semi-detached properties on the same side of the road which share similar facades, materials, side garages and front porches that protrude ahead of the main dwelling. This group represents only a small portion of the road however, and while there are some similarities with another small group of properties opposite, in the wider street scene there is considerable variation in design.

5. Although most garages in the immediate area are physically separated from porches, the relationship between these two elements varies considerably in the vicinity of the site. There are examples where they appear connected, such as at No 99, where the road is as straight as it is outside the appeal site, and the garage is flush with the porch. This is also the case for numerous properties on the other side of the road. Furthermore, at No 107, the porch and garage each have a pitched roof that brings these two elements to the same height and creates a visual link between them.
6. Therefore, while projecting single storey front elements contribute to a distinctive and defined rhythm in the street, the degree of separation between garages and porches varies and, consequently, does not make a significant contribution to this rhythm or to overall local character.
7. The proposed development would convert the existing garage into habitable space for an office, playroom and utility and extend it forward, linking it to the porch with a pitched roof. With the removal of the garage door, the development would appear as a forward protruding porch, albeit on a wider scale than others in this immediate group of dwellings. The garage and porch would no longer read as two separate elements from the public realm, however given the variation in such features locally this would not be incongruous or harmful to the street scene.
8. Due to the single storey nature and small scale of the proposed extension, it would appear subservient to the main dwelling and would not appear dominant. The development proposed would therefore respect the local pattern of development and respond appropriately to the scale and form of existing buildings.
9. For the reasons above, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted 2011) which expects new development to deliver high quality urban design. I also find no conflict with Policies DM26, DM27, DM28 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (adopted 2014) which together expect development proposals to contribute positively to local character.

Conditions

10. I have recommended a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to provide certainty.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

T Mansfield

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR