



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

By G Powys Jones FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3360337

2 Naishcombe Hill, Wick, South Gloucestershire, BS30 5QW

- 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 & Mrs Butler against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02438/HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension to provide additional accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The appeal site is located within the Bristol and Bath Green Belt (GB). Accordingly, the main issue is whether the proposed extension would be inappropriate development in the GB and, if so, whether other considerations clearly outweigh the harm to the GB so as to amount to very special circumstances.

Reasons

Whether Inappropriate Development

3. The Framework¹ establishes that the construction of new buildings in the GB should be regarded as inappropriate unless one of the specified exceptions applies. These include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
4. Policy CS5 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) provides that proposals for development in the GB must comply with the provisions of the Framework. Policy PSP7 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (LP) provides more detailed policy guidance in that it sets out the level of volume increases to buildings within the GB likely to be considered as disproportionate or not disproportionate additions.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling set on a junction - that of Court View and Naishcombe Hill. It stands alongside other similar development fronting Naishcombe Hill on rising land. Its attached neighbour has been extended in two-storey fashion, to the rear. The appellants propose a two storey extension to the

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework

side. It appears to be common ground, taking account of the conservatory's proposed demolition, that the additional volume created would be 57% over and above that of the host property.

6. The Framework contains no empirical guidance on what constitutes a disproportionate addition. It thus calls for the application of planning judgment depending on circumstances. On the other hand, LP policy PSP7 provides reasonably detailed guidance on this aspect with reference to a scale of volumes. It provides that a volume increase of up to 30% would generally be regarded as proportionate. Anything above that and up to 50% would need careful assessment, whilst additions resulting in a volume increase over 50% would most likely be considered a disproportionate addition.
7. The appellant considers that the extension is only slightly over the 50% threshold and that the Council has failed to properly consider the property's 'suburban' context and has overly relied on GB policy. It seems to me, however, that LP policy PSP7 is reasonably flexible and generous in its provisions, making due allowances for context and the application of judgment. To my mind an extension of the size proposed would go beyond that normally considered a maximum addition. I therefore find a clear conflict with local development plan GB policy. Given its size, the proposed extension would also be rightly considered as a disproportionate addition in the terms of the Framework.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal comprises inappropriate development in the GB, which, by definition, is harmful, and this carries substantial weight against the development.

Other considerations

9. I concur with the appellant that the plot size is large enough to accommodate the development to allow sufficient remaining garden area. However, despite the adoption of some features designed to make the extension appear subordinate, the extension would be widely seen given its prominence on rising land at a junction, where openness is a significant feature.
10. The extension in my view would appear overly bulky, largely on account of its depth and width, and would alter the character of the semi-detached dwelling almost to that of a mini terrace, at odds with the form of other dwellings to the east on the same side of the road. The development would thus be in conflict with the design requirements of CS policy CS1 and LP policy PSP38.
11. I have noted the personal reason why the extension is said to be needed, and although very few details have been provided, I have taken this aspect into account. Whilst personal circumstances are capable of being material considerations they are outweighed in this case by the policy and other considerations.
12. The Council cited a third reason for refusal. However, taking account of the content of the plans taken as a whole, the appellants' proposals are clear.

Overall Conclusions

13. The proposal would amount to harmful inappropriate development within the GB. In accordance with the Framework's guidance, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the GB.

14. Taken together, the other considerations provide little support for the scheme; indeed, I find the proposal conflicts with the Council's design policies. Therefore, they do not outweigh the harm to the GB and very special circumstances do not exist. The proposed extension would not accord with the development plan in respect of GB and design policy and there are no other material considerations to outweigh those findings. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR