



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2025 by A Conteh

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3357111

1 Downleaze Drive, Chipping Sodbury, South Gloucestershire BS37 6EU

- 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 Mrs Natalie Winkworth against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02290/HH.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to provide car port and bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to provide car port and bedroom at 1 Downleaze Drive, Chipping Sodbury, South Gloucestershire, BS37 6EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P24/02290/HH, 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 4353/P3 Rev A, 4353/P4 Rev A and 4353/P5 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, including the colour, texture, coursing and mortar colour.

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.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling consists of a single-storey original section with part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extensions set back significantly from the original building. The dwellings along Downleaze Drive exhibit a diverse range of architectural details, although the general character of the area can be described as residential with older, detached dwellings, most of a considerable size.

5. The appeal property was historically as a gate lodge and elements of its original character remain. However, the existing two-storey extension has a somewhat disjointed and separate appearance and appears as a backdrop to the modest original dwelling. The scale and siting of the extension has created an unsympathetic relationship between the host dwelling and extension. As a result, the appearance of the appeal property has changed to the point that the small scale of the original lodge building is no longer obvious. This has undermined the property's original character and caused it to look different to nearby residential dwellings.
6. The proposed development would bring the two existing elements together, introducing cohesion to the site. Therefore, the addition of a two-storey linking element would not detract from the current character of the property. The proposed undercroft would be a somewhat unusual feature in this streetscene, but would provide a degree of openness on the front elevation, reducing the visual bulk of the proposal.
7. From most public views the proposed development would be screened by the existing two-storey extension and the roof of the original part of the dwelling. Furthermore, views of the site are restricted by a sizable and continuous hedge which also provides screening along parts of the site boundary. Consequently, the visual impact of the proposed development would be limited from the public realm.
8. The scale and mass of the proposed development, previous extensions and the original dwelling would be in keeping with the size of many nearby dwellings. The plot is sizeable, and the proposal would infill a corner in front of the existing extension with no loss of parking or garden space. Therefore, the proposal would not result in the site appearing overdeveloped and the development would not appear bulky, prominent or overwhelming.
9. The proposed stonework at first floor level would be a continuation of the existing ground floor plinth, so demonstrates regard for the existing appearance of the dwelling. Despite concerns raised that this feature might appear too heavy in this position, I saw that a number of properties have stonework or low eaves with cat-slide roofs. Consequently, there are a range of materials in the street scene and a degree of solidity in materials at a similar height to what is proposed here. Therefore, the proposed development would be in line with the varied character and appearance of the area and would therefore achieve a high standard of design that is informed by its context.
10. The proposal would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore comply with Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) and Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006 - 2027 (2013) insofar as they require new development to respect or enhance the site, street and surrounding area.
11. It would also align with guidance set out in the South Gloucestershire Design Checklist Supplementary Planning Document (2007) and with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), which both encourage development to respond to local character without foregoing innovation.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would increase built development towards the boundary with the immediate neighbour, a bungalow. The bulk of the development would however be adjacent to the neighbouring driveway, with a garage between the bungalow and the shared boundary. The outlook from the front of the bungalow would remain open. Therefore, while the proposed extension would be visible from the nearest windows in the neighbouring property, it would not appear unduly overbearing and would not prejudice the living conditions of the occupiers of that property.

Conditions

13. Conditions related to the time limit on commencement and carrying out development in accordance with plans are recommended in the interest of certainty. Use of matching materials, particularly in relation to the stonework, is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
14. A condition suggested by the Sustainable Transport team regarding bound driveway material is not relevant to this proposal as the scheme does not affect the existing driveway or provision of parking spaces. As a result, I have not recommended that it be imposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

A Conteh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR