



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3360294

137 Stockwood Road, Stockwood, Bristol, BS14 8JN

- 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 M Tomes against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04325/H.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

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

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and,
 - the living conditions of occupiers of 4 Meardon Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey semi-detached house with a flat roofed garage attached to the side, level with the front elevation main building line, and a flat roofed porch that projects forward of it. The neighbouring pair of houses were similarly designed although No 24 has a first floor side extension. Other houses nearby are a mixture of semi-detached and detached which share common designs, albeit different to that of the appeal property.
5. Policy DM29 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (LP) requires an extension to be subservient to its host building in terms of its scale and roof form. The council's Supplementary

Planning Document 2 (A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions) (2005) (SPD) further advises that side extensions on semi-detached houses should be stepped back from the front wall of the house and stepped down from the roof to ensure subservience to the main house and maintain its character and balance with its adjoining neighbour.

6. The proposed side extension would project forward of the main building line on the ground floor to join the front porch, resulting in the front projecting ground floor element extending across more than half the width of the house, dominating its frontage. The proposed single pitched roof would further draw attention to the difference in scale and form to that of the front porch which projects forward on the adjoining house. The second floor element would be the same height as the main roof, and follow the front building line, rather than being set back and down from the roof. It would not therefore be subservient to the host property and the resultant widening of the frontage would further reduce the symmetry it shares with the adjoining house and upset the balance between the pair. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy CS21 of the Bristol Local Plan Core Strategy (2011) (CS), Policies DM26, DM27, and DM30 of the LP and Paragraph 139 of the Framework which require side extensions to be well designed and subservient to the host property.

Living conditions

7. The appeal property side boundary forms the rear boundary for Nos 2 and 4 Meardon Road, which back onto the appeal site close to the junction of Meardon Road and Stockwood Road. The appeal property is set back from the road and consequently the main house side wall is directly behind No 4 but separated from it by No 4's rear garden and the appeal property's single storey garage which runs close to the boundary. Nonetheless, the side wall above the ground floor is visible over the boundary hedge and dominates views from No 4's rear windows and rear garden substantially filling the field of view from them. Whilst occupiers of No 4 will be used to its overbearing presence, the proposed side extension would bring the first floor of the appeal property up to the boundary, closing the gap and increasing its domineering and overbearing presence to a degree that would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No 4. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would conflict with Policy BCS21 of the CS, Policies DM27, DM29 and DM30 of the LP, the SPD and the Framework which seek to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions nearby. No 144, opposite the appeal site has a first floor extension above its attached garage which is not set back from the main building line or set down from the main roof ridge. However, that appears to be the only alteration to the property. The symmetry at ground floor level that extends to the neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses, including No 146 to which it is linked by their adjoining garages, results in a more balanced appearance that retains their common character, which would not be the case for the appeal proposal. No 145 does not have a second floor extension and No 151's second floor extension is set back from the main building line which to some extent reduces its dominance. No 141 has a forward projecting extension and a second floor extension which is not set back or down and is similarly dominant to the appeal proposal. However, it retains the flat roof at ground floor level and thus

some degree of symmetry with its neighbour. The examples provided are not therefore directly comparable with the appeal proposal. 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

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR