



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2025

by **A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3360566

39 Sweet Pea Way Emersons Green Bristol BS16 7QE

- 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 D Mohammed against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02734/HH.
 - The development proposed is Erection of rear conservatory (Retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erection of rear conservatory at 39 Sweet Pea Way Emersons Green Bristol BS16 7QE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P24/0217/HH, and the plans submitted with it, specifically DR-06; DR-07 and DR-08.

Main Issue

2. The Main Issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The development for which planning permission is sought retrospectively is described as a conservatory, a monopitch structure 3m in height and projecting to a depth of 4m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling (No.39), spanning its entire width. A 'fixed' section (the end bay) fills the space at the eastern end up to the side boundary. No.39 is a two-storey detached house of very recent construction within the Lyde Green Estate. Whilst a particular feature of the locality around the appeal site is visual integrity that follows from consistent use of external walling with a stone appearance, the steep-pitched slate or interlocking tile roofing are generic design components which have no specific local relevance.
4. The development fills the entire width of the garden between the set-back garage (which aligns with the south west flank wall of the house) and the boundary opposite and was, at the time of my visit, entirely open-sided on its principal north-west elevation facing the garden. The fabric roof also open. The resulting structure is therefore designed as an amenity area which can be enclosed with glass side panels when the weather is inclement but open to, and part of, the garden at other

times. Although the structure is enclosed at each end and visible from other locations, it is apparent in some viewpoints but not prominent in the street scene.

5. Policy PSP1 of the of the South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan, Sites and Places Plan (November 2017) (SGLP) seeks that development should respond to local character and reflect local identity, pointing to the absence of local distinctiveness in development of preceding decades but noting that 'modern forms' of development that take cues from locally distinctive development forms are welcomed. Policy PSP38 of the SGLP states that residential extensions are acceptable subject to criteria, in which regard the design should not harm visual and residential amenity. The Householder Design Guide section on rear extensions includes references to the principle of subservience, but also recommendations that are suitable for masonry extensions and cannot be realistically applied to a framed glazed structure such as a conservatory.
6. The appellant represents the development, other than the 'end bay', as being permitted by The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO). Whilst that is not before me to determine, it is not disputed that there could be a rear extension in the same location and although the 'end bay' and lack of separation from the side garage are visually clumsy features of the proposal, these aspects of the development have very limited impact overall.
7. The Council suggest that the proposal's design is 'more visually impactful than ...a standard brick extension or typical conservatory', which appears to acknowledge that a dwelling such as No.39 may be extended in varying ways. In its use of glass within a dark grey metal structure, I consider that what has been erected is visually less intrusive than a 'typical conservatory', which is usually constructed from white PVC. Overall, the development is perceived as an addition that is visually subservient to the form of the host dwelling by virtue of its low height, subdued colour, and framed, lightweight character.
8. I therefore conclude that the development does not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor the area in which it is located. I find little conflict with Policy PSP38 or CS1 of the SGLP or, therefore, with the development plan overall. Consequently, taking all matters raised into account, the appeal succeeds. As the development has been completed, seemingly per the submitted plans, which I have identified for clarity, no conditions are necessary.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR