



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: 05 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3353107

20 Darnley Avenue, Horfield, Bristol City, Bristol BS7 0BS

- 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 John Clarke against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00372/H.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and rear loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and rear loft extension at 20 Darnley Avenue, Horfield, Bristol City, Bristol BS7 0BS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00372/H, and the plans submitted with it, 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 drawing nos. 0038-001, 0038-105 rev A, 0038-110 rev A, 0038-111 rev A, 0038-112 rev B, 0038-113 rev A, 0038-130 Rev A, 0038-131 Rev A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Preliminary Matters.

2. The appeal proposal includes a two-storey side extension and rear loft extension. The reason for refusal refers only to the side extension and I therefore have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council has confirmed that the plan numbers listed on the decision notice were incorrect and that the plans submitted as part of the appeal are those on which the Council based their decision. I have considered the appeal on the basis of these plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site (no.20) is a two-storey dwelling located at the end of a terrace of similar properties. Darnley Avenue is characterised by terraced dwellings arranged in groups which vary in number. The properties in the street are set back a similar

amount from the road which provides a degree of consistency. However, there is some variation in design between the groups. Some terraces are characterised by two storey gabled bays whereas the properties within the terrace of which the appeal site is part, have ground floor bay windows and plain pitched roofs.

6. The size of the gaps between terraces varies significantly along Darnley Avenue. The groups on the west side of the road have a generous gap between them created by Crofton Avenue. Those on the east side of Darnley Avenue to the south of the appeal site are separated by a much narrower gap. The wider area, beyond Darnley Avenue is primarily characterised by a mix of terraces and semi-detached houses with varying gaps between the groups. These gaps serve an important role in providing visual relief in the street scene and contributing to the character of the area
7. Presently the gap between no.20 and the neighbouring property (no.22) to the south is relatively generous with space between each of the two dwellings and the boundary fence. It is proposed to erect a two-storey side extension to the south side of no.20 which would sit within this gap, stopping slightly short of the boundary. Consequently, the gap would be narrowed, bringing the two distinct terraces closer together. The Design Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 (October 2005) (SPD) suggest that 'ideally' 1m should be retained between the extension and the boundary, 'where space is available'. However, this advice is specifically aimed at detached or semi-detached houses.
8. The space between the hipped roof of the proposed extension and the existing hipped roof of no.22 would provide a sense of separation between the two dwellings. Furthermore, the gap would not be dissimilar to that which exists between terraces further south on Darnley Avenue. Although there would be less than 1m between the side elevation of the extension and the boundary, the remaining gap between nos. 20 and 22 would be sufficient to provide a meaningful visual break between the two groups thereby avoiding a terracing effect. As such, the proposal would not conflict with the existing character and appearance of the area.
9. The SPD advises that on end of terrace houses it is often more suitable to continue the terrace building line and roof ridge height so that the extension becomes part of the terrace. The appeal proposal would continue the ridge height of the existing house in accordance with this advice, although the front elevation of the extension would be set back from the main front elevation of the dwelling.
10. This design would both respond to the linear character of the existing terrace whilst creating a degree of subservience to the host building. As a result, the extension would be secondary in character and would not dominate the existing building. Furthermore, it would provide a successful transition between the two terraces of differing design. Consequently, the proposed extension would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
11. I conclude that the proposed side extension would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore accord with Policies BCS21 of the Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011) and Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014). Together these seek to ensure that

new developments deliver high quality design, contribute towards local character and distinctiveness and that extensions respect the character of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time limit and approved plans condition in the interests of certainty and clarity. I have also imposed a condition requiring that the materials match those used in the host dwelling in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR