



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2025 by R Pankhurst

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3354197

36 Memorial Road, Hanham, South Gloucestershire, BS15 3JQ

- 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 Charlie Doust against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/01414/HH.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension to include utility room and downstairs shower room/WC with wrap around porch to front of property to eliminate cold in hallway. First floor windows to front elevation for existing small bedroom to be changed to opaque to provide privacy as this will become the upstairs family bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant sought to submit amended plans at appeal stage. The Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England is clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and interested parties at the application stage. Therefore, in the interests of fairness I have considered this appeal based on the plans before the Council at the time it made its decision, and not the amended plans.
4. Policy PSP39 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted November 2017) (PSSP) is referred to in the Council's decision letter and officer report. The Council has confirmed that this was in error and that Policy PSP39 is not relevant to this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The immediate area is characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings with two-storey box bay windows and hipped roofs, which are distinctive and prominent features in the street scene. There is, however, some variation in the design of pairs of semi-detached dwellings, with many opting to extend to the side and to add front porches, contributing to some imbalance between pairs.
7. The proposed porch would project past the two-storey bay window of the host property and feature a pitched roof with gable end to the front. This gable feature would be distinctly different to the much simpler form of most other similar extensions in the street. It would also appear at odds with the hipped roof of the side extension, and would project past the bay window, starting to compete with the prominence of that distinctive feature. Consequently, while overall it would be relatively small scale and not dominate the dwelling, the design would appear incongruous and would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and local area.
8. The use of anthracite coloured weatherboard and the high-level fenestration on the proposed extension would be further discordant features and a jarring contrast to the host property. I note that the appellant has indicated their willingness to use render instead, and this could be resolved by a planning condition were the scheme otherwise acceptable. The use of more sympathetic materials would not however address the design harm identified above.
9. The appellant has referred me to examples of side and front extensions locally. Numbers 82, 84 and 86 Whittucks Road are a different style of dwelling to the appeal site, with gable roofs, two-storey side extensions and no bay windows. Therefore, the use of gabled porches does not have the same visual impact as on the appeal site. 121 Memorial Road is a bungalow with a gable roof and no bay windows and 19 Vicarage Close has gable features and a projecting porch. In both properties the central gable does not unduly compete with any other features on these otherwise simple dwellings.
10. Numbers 24 to 46 Memorial Road and 2 Kings Avenue have a mixture of side extensions and porches of different designs. Some are separate elements so are visually separate. Some are wraparound extensions, but these have a simple hipped roof, and the materials used match the host property, so they are sympathetic to the dwelling and the wider area. For these reasons, the properties referred to are not comparable to the appeal proposal. These examples therefore carry very limited weight and do not outweigh the harm the proposed development would cause.
11. The proposal would help the thermal performance of the dwelling and result in sustainability benefits; however these would be small scale and it has not been demonstrated that equivalent benefits could not be achieved with a less harmful design. I appreciate that the proposed gable would enable the front door to open inwards, and that the appellant has sought to constrain the floor area of the porch to 3m². However, that area is what is allowed under permitted development legislation, so is not a restriction that must be followed where planning permission is required. Therefore, I give these matters very limited weight, and they do not justify the harm identified above.

12. The appellant indicates that permission has already been granted for a smaller side extension. A porch could also potentially be constructed as permitted development. Accordingly, there is a possibility that a similar proposal could be implemented if this appeal is dismissed. However, I do not have plans for the side extension, and therefore it has not been demonstrated that this alternative scheme would be more harmful than the appeal proposal. Consequently, this potential fallback does not outweigh the harm identified above.
13. While I recognise that the appellant is willing to amend the design of the proposal, such changes cannot reasonably be secured by planning condition as it would prejudice interested parties who would expect any permission to be for the scheme that they had seen and would deny them the ability to comment on any changes. These matters do not therefore justify the harm I have identified.
14. Therefore, the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policy PSP38 of the PSSP which requires extensions to respect the building line, form, window shape, detailing and external materials of the street and surrounding area. It would also fail to accord with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted December 2013) which, amongst other things, requires development proposals to demonstrate that detailing and materials respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the site and its context.
15. Furthermore, there would also be conflict with guidance in the South Gloucestershire Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted March 2021) which states that all extensions should aim to achieve successful integration by reflecting the characteristics of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and resulting conflict with the development plan. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Pankhurst

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and I agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR