



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/F0114/D/25/3362113

22 Grange Road Saltford Bristol BS31 3AG

- 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 Jessica Fragapane against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03722/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Erection of two storey extension and garage with single storey rear extension following demolition of existing garage. External works to provide for carriage driveway with additional access to Grange Road and associated hard landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Main Issue is the effect of the development upon the living conditions of occupiers of 20 Grange Road Saltford.

Reasons

3. Grange Road is an established residential area with a mix of housing types including, on its north-western side, detached dwellings in large plots. The existing garage of modest height located along the side boundary of the appeal site (No.22) would be replaced with a deep two storey extension, infilling to its north-eastern boundary with No.20 Grange Road (No.20). The extension would mirror the side wing of the original house¹ which is comprised of two storeys and a dual-pitched roof, thereby creating an H-plan layout, albeit with the rear indent already infilled with a flat-roofed two-storey extension. The result would be a structure of significant mass and height, in excess of 7.5m to its ridge, position along the shared boundary. The proposed side bay would also extend beyond the rear elevation of No.22 with a single-storey flat roofed element.
4. No.20 has a plan form which is indented on its south-west side such that some habitable rooms gain access to daylight from the area which is currently adjacent to the part of the boundary where the extension would be positioned. These include a first floor bedroom window and windows to ground floor habitable rooms. Whilst I

¹ on its south-western side

note the appellant's comments on separation and a correction of the officer report, the existing garage has no discernible impact in terms of perceived enclosure or shadowing due to its modest height. Although the appellant refers to a separation distance of 5.7m, this is only equivalent to what currently exists at ground level and would represent a substantial reduction from the equivalent dimension above ground floor level.

5. The appellant has provided a brief report which suggests that the area of the garden receiving direct sunlight would be reduced by an amount which is not likely to be noticeable and asserts that the proposal would meet BRE criteria. Limited background is provided in support and I note that the areas referred to appear differ significantly from the garden area available consequently it is not clear how the figures used in the report relate to various parts of the garden/amenity areas of No.20, or to what extent the change would affect its use in terms of those parts which are most accessible. Nor does this report mention the impact in terms of access to daylight for habitable rooms where windows are likely to be affected by the proposal as my previous comments indicate. I therefore attach little weight to this evidence.
6. My observations direct that although the rear garden of No.20 has an open north-westerly aspect and parts of those gardens will be unaffected by the proposal, the introduction of built form along the shared boundary to the height indicated are likely to noticeably impact upon access to afternoon sun and parts which are most-used which would impair both the amenity value of spaces close to the house itself and also reduce access to daylight/sunlight for windows to some habitable rooms. Even if it were demonstrated that the effect of the proposal in terms of shading were not unacceptable, in the absence of any space for planting to soften an otherwise unrelieved wall of more than 5.0m height to eaves, the proximity, height and length of the proposed extension along the boundary would be unacceptably overbearing.
7. The appellant points to a number of justifications for the extension of the dwelling, these include reference to a previous appeal but the circumstances are not comparable as is clear from my reasoning. A need to accommodate an aging family member to move in with the family would carry some weight however the submitted plans do not indicate a ground-floor bedroom which would be usual for such provision, in any event there would be alternative ways of making such provision without significant impact on neighbouring users. Overall, the proposal would conflict with Policy D6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan (2023) which, amongst other matters, seeks that development should not cause significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring users.
8. A number of other matters are outlined in the case officer report but these cannot outweigh the harms I have identified. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and consequently, for the reasons given and taking into account all matters raised, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR