



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2025

by **E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3353553

61 Siston Common, Warmley, Bristol, South Glos BS15 4PA

- 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 Chris Green against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P/24/01739/F.
 - The development proposed is change of use of agricultural land to Class C3 private amenity space and 2 storey extension to provide additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of agricultural land to Class C3 private amenity space and 2 storey extension to provide additional living accommodation at 61 Siston Common, Warmley, Bristol, South Glos BS15 4PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/24/01739/F, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area; and
 - the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupants of 59 Siston Common (no.59) with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site (no.61) comprises a mid-terrace property which is adjoined to the rear by a small, open field. The host dwelling is part of one of a number of groups of dwellings which are set amongst open grassland which is crossed by roads and footpaths. The wider area therefore has an open, verdant character. The rear of the appeal site is visible from the Dramway footpath which runs alongside the northwestern boundary of the field to the rear.
4. The terrace of which the appeal site is part has a relatively consistent front and rear building line, however it otherwise exhibits considerable variety in respect of roof form, eaves, ridge, fenestration and design.

5. The staggered boundary between nos. 59 and 61 means that the rear elevation of the appeal property is wider than the front elevation. The proposed extension would not extend the full width of the rear elevation of the host dwelling and would stop short of the boundary with no.59 at ground floor. The depth of the extension would be relatively modest and significantly less than that of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the ridgeline would be at the same height as that of the existing dormers and would therefore be lower than the main ridge of the parent building.
6. For these reasons the proposed extension would read as a subservient addition to the host dwelling. The eaves would be higher than those of nos. 61a and 59 however this is already the case. It would be secondary to the parent dwelling in terms of height, width and depth and would echo the gabled dormer feature of the existing roof. Consequently, the proposal would respect and reflect the proportions and design of the existing dwelling and would not result in an incongruous or overly dominant addition to the property.
7. The extension would project beyond the established rear building line of the cottages which form the terrace. However, the overall linear character of the terrace would not be harmfully eroded because of the design features which ensure it would be a subservient addition. Furthermore, non-linear terraced properties are clearly in evidence nearby. The properties to the southeast, which are visible from the rear of the appeal site, are arranged in a staggered formation. Other houses which front Siston Common to the northwest of the appeal site are varied in form. In this context, the proposed extension would not result in a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area.
8. Although the extension would be visible from the nearby footpath, it would be a generous distance from it and would be seen against the backdrop of the existing building. Therefore, it would not result in a significant adverse impact on users of the path. Due to the existing degree of visual containment to the existing field at the rear of the site, it would not be widely visible in wider public views.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore comply with Policies CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy 2006 – 2027 (CS), Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (Adopted November 2017) (PSPP) and the Householder Design Guide SPD. Together these seek to ensure that development proposals achieve a high standard of design, respect and respond positively to the character and distinctiveness of the site and its context and that extensions should respect the features of the street and the surrounding area.

Living conditions

10. Adjoining the appeal site to the northwest is no.59 which has windows at ground and first floor level on the rear elevation. The proposed extension would be set away from the boundary between the two properties and therefore the windows would be a generous distance from the flank wall. Furthermore, the proposed extension would not project significantly beyond these windows. As a consequence, the proposal would not result in unacceptable light levels within the rooms which are served by these windows.

11. Although the extension would be to the southeast of the windows on the rear elevation of number 59, because it would not be excessively deep it would not overshadow them to an unacceptable degree.
12. The proposed extension would be visible from the rear windows of no. 59. However given the extent to which it would be set away from the boundary, it would not appear oppressive or overbearing in views from these windows.
13. I conclude that the proposed extension would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 59 Siston Common (no.59) with particular reference to outlook and light. It would therefore comply with Policies CS1 of the CS, Policies PSP8 and PSP38 of the PSPP and the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted March 2021) SPD. Together these seek to ensure that developments do not prejudice the amenity of neighbours.
14. Policy PSP1 of the PSPP is listed in the second reason for refusal however this relates to local distinctiveness and as such is not relevant to this main issue.

Other Matters

15. The Council are content with the proposed change of use of agricultural land to private amenity space. Based on the evidence before me and my observations I see no reason to come to a contrary view.

Conditions

16. I have undertaken some minor editing of the conditions suggested by the Council in the interests of precision and clarity. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. The materials used should match those used in the existing dwelling to ensure a satisfactory appearance. Conditions relating to the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey, the provision of bird and bat boxes and the approval of lighting details are necessary to ensure that the proposal does not result in unacceptable ecological impacts.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 drawing nos: Site location plan, Block Plan, CC/04C, CC/05A, CC/06C, CC/07C, CC/08C and CC/09.
- 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.
- 4) The development shall proceed in strict accordance with the mitigation measures provided in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Herdwick Ecology, January 2023) and Bat Survey (Crossman Associates, July 2024).
- 5) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved bird and bat boxes shall be installed in accordance with details regarding the location and specification of the boxes, which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The boxes shall be retained in situ thereafter.
- 6) No external lighting shall be installed unless details have first been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. Such details shall include lighting specifications and locations designed to prevent light spill over boundary vegetation, and bat commuting/foraging habitat so they are not deterred from using the site and that important habitats/ new roost provisions are not illuminated. Any external lighting shall only be installed in accordance with the approved details.

End of Schedule