



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3358987

105 Saltmarsh Drive, Bristol BS11 0NL

- 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 Ms Bea Olero against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02975/H.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the cabin to build an office/resting area at the end of the garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the cabin to build an office/resting area at the end of the garden at 105 Saltmarsh Drive, Bristol BS11 0NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02975/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 : Location plan, RDK/MR/1160/DWG - 03, RDK/MR/1160/DWG – 04, RDK/MR/1160/DWG – 05, RDK/MR/1160/DWG – 07.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with respect to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property consists of a two storey semi-detached dwelling, with a single storey outbuilding in the rear garden. I observed that there are visible outbuildings, of varying scale and design within the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. As such, outbuildings in rear gardens are a part of the established local character and pattern of development in the surrounding area.
4. The supplementary planning document 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (2005) (SPD) advises that '*the design of garages and garden*

buildings should generally respect the scale, character and materials of your property’.

5. The proposal would increase the size of the existing outbuilding and would be larger than the visible neighbouring outbuildings. Nevertheless, it would remain subservient to the main dwelling and even combined with the existing outbuilding and structures, the majority of the good-sized rear garden space would remain open and usable. There would be no significant reduction therefore to the availability of green space for residents and, given the minor scale of the proposal, there would be no harm to biodiversity in this managed rear garden environment.
6. Given its minor scale compared to the main house, the outbuilding would sit comfortably within the rear garden and would not appear cramped within the plot nor insensitive. There would be no harm to the character, layout, and pattern of development of the existing property nor the surrounding context.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor surrounding area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and Policies DM21, DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2014) (DM). These, in part, require development to reflect local distinctiveness and context and contribute positively to an area’s character.

Living conditions

8. Whilst not specifically referring to outbuildings in this context, the SPD advises that extensions should not be overbearing.
9. The adjoining neighbour, No 103 has an outbuilding adjacent to the side boundary with the appeal property, next to the rear boundary. The existing outlook from the rear of this neighbouring property is over the good-sized garden towards the outbuilding and boundary treatment to the trees beyond.
10. The extended outbuilding would be located immediately adjacent to this existing outbuilding at the rear of the garden. Whilst not excessive in height, it would be taller than this neighbouring structure and would be obliquely glimpsed over the existing boundary treatment. Nevertheless, views over the rear garden would remain, as would the outlook to the trees at the rear. The development would not therefore result in undue harm to the outlook from the rear facing windows, or the garden of this neighbouring property.
11. To the rear is open land and to the other side boundary is the existing outbuilding of the appeal property. The existing element of the outbuilding would prevent any massing or the additional built form of the proposal facing this side boundary. The proposal would not therefore harm the outlook or other amenity of the occupiers of any other property.
12. The proposal would therefore not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with respect to outlook. There is no conflict therefore with the protection of amenity goals of CS Policy BCS21 and DM Policy DM30.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty.
14. The proposal before me is not for a separate dwelling. Conditions restricting the use of the outbuilding to purposes incidental or ancillary to the main dwelling are unnecessary as a separate independent use would require further permission. A restriction on cooking facilities is also unnecessary, as this would not alter the character of the site nor harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in any way.

Conclusion

15. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR