



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3361970

148 Whittucks Road Hanham Bristol BS15 3PY

- 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 Jack Scott against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/00147/HH.
 - The development proposed is Double storey side and rear extensions to form additional living and bedroom accommodation. Additions to rear parking arrangements including demolition of garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development appearing on the decision notice differs from that appearing on the application form and appears incomplete. I have therefore used the description appearing on the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No. 148 Whittucks Road (No.148) is a two-storey semi-detached property dating from the mid-late twentieth century, located on a corner plot at the junction with Willow Road in an area of similar housing. The proposal would provide additional accommodation for occupiers at both ground and first floors by a wide side extension and a rear single-storey addition. The extension would increase the width of the dwelling by approximately 75% of the width of the existing dwelling which conflicts with the Council's Householder Design Guide SPD (Design Guide), however, that guidance does acknowledge: 'how the extension relates to the main dwellinghouse and the wider street scene is also material to whether it is subservient'. The Council express concern as to the width of the proposed extension such that it would appear as an (additional) attached dwelling. Whilst this impression may arise from the dual fenestration of the additional (single) rooms at

each level, the design overall presents as a single dwelling because of its single prominent entrance.

5. The plot is of a similar size to that on the opposing corner (No.146) where a wide extension and L-shaped plan form has resulted in a better articulation of a splayed corner setting (and the design opportunities which such locations provide) in which regard the Design Guidance is largely silent.
6. Given the differences both of position within their plots and of built form in that No.146 is detached and employs hipped roofs, it would not be realistic to seek any design equivalence between extensions to No.146 and No.148. However, as the Design Guidance makes clear, street scene is a main consideration and whilst the width of the proposed extension would broadly balance that which appears on the opposing corner; unlike that found at No.146, the degree of setback from the original front elevation fails to respect the existing spaciousness of the corner. The proposal would inappropriately crowd upon the splayed boundary to the detriment of the public realm, an impact which would outweigh any considerations as to its subservience. The appellant points to other unidentified extensions however the corner location of the appeal site requires specific consideration.
7. Overall, I consider the proposed extension would not represent High Quality Design 2013 as required by Policy CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2013, and would also conflict with PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (Adopted November 2017) which together seek that development should respond constructively to the distinctiveness of the locality and respect the line, form and scale of surrounding development. Therefore, for the reasons given and taking into account all matters raised, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR