
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2025

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3359411

9 Wyck Beck Road, Brentry, Bristol, BS10 7JD

- 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 Oliver Giltrow against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/04013/H.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side, and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council have amended the description of the development from that included on the application form. As the description is not at variance with the scope of the application, I have used the description used by the Council on its decision notice in this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on i) the living conditions of the present and future occupiers of the neighbouring property 7 Wyck Beck Road with regards to being overbearing, and ii) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The appeal proposal would replace an existing single-storey pitched roof garage and flat roofed car port, with a two-storey side extension. The front elevation of the extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwelling by around 2.5m, whilst its rear elevation would be approximately half a metre further back into the rear garden than the rear elevation of the existing garage building.
5. The extension would be situated between the southern gable of the existing main two-storey dwelling and its' common boundary with the adjacent property at 7 Wyck Beck Road (No.7). The side wall of the existing garage is almost on the common boundary, and the new extension would follow this positioning. Whilst the overall length of the extension would be longer than the existing garage and car port, a good portion of this would sit alongside the gable of the property at No.7 which has no windows in it facing the proposal. The extent of the footprint of development would therefore have little impact on the existing and future occupants of No.7.

6. Whilst the extent of the footprint of the proposal would not be an issue, the proposal is for full two-storey development, raising the eaves level of development along this common boundary by around 3m in height from that which currently exists, to a wall of around 5.6m in height. Whilst around two-fifths of this length would sit alongside the gable of No.7, the remaining three-fifths of the length of the proposal would protrude behind the line of the rear elevation of No.7.
7. The southern elevation of the proposal which faces No.7 has no proposed windows or openings in it, and thus there are no issues in relation to overlooking as a result. Similarly, the appeal property is situated to the north of No.7 and therefore, there are no concerns in relation to the proposal impacting on the level of natural daylight to No.7.
8. The gable of No.7 is between two and a half and three metres from the common boundary between the two properties. The windows from habitable rooms in the rear elevation of No.7 closest to the appeal property, particularly at ground floor level, would have little impact on them from the existing garage and car port if the 45-degree visibility rule was applied horizontally and vertically from them. However, this would not be the case with the proposal, as the additional length and height of the proposals' southern elevation, would render the proposed extension highly visible, both in length and particularly in height, to the extent of being overbearing.
9. The overbearing impact which would be experienced internally from within No.7 would be more acute when occupiers were using their garden, as the cumulative overbearing impact of the full length and height of the blank wall running along the common boundary would be more apparent, significantly restricting views out of the garden to the surrounding area. I note that the present occupier of No.7 has not objected to the proposal. However, if approved, the proposal would be present for many years and future occupiers of No.7 may not find the proposal to be so acceptable.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) and policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014), which require, amongst other things, that development should deliver high quality design that safeguards the amenity of existing development and neighbours, with appropriate levels of outlook and creates a high-quality environment for future occupiers.

Character and Appearance

11. The appeal property is located on Wyck Beck Road (A4018), a busy dual carriageway highway, from which the appeal property takes its vehicular access. The area is predominantly residential at this point in the road and is characterised by a range of property styles with no over-riding architectural language, and of a mix of ages and types, including bungalows, dormer bungalows and two-storey dwellings, all in a range of sizes from modest to large. Development becomes increasingly more commercial as one travels 50m or so further north from the appeal property on the A4018, the highway subsequently providing access to the M5 at Cribs Causeway around half a mile away.
12. There are a range of gaps between the side gables of the properties on the road, particularly where properties have been modernised or developed, resulting in the density of development becoming greater than that which previously existed.

13. The appeal proposal would create a two-storey extension to the left (south) of the main two-storey section of the property, replacing a single storey garage and car port. These existing elements are developed up to the common boundary with No.7, and the proposal would follow this existing building line. The front elevation of the proposal would be set back from the principal front elevation of the property by around 2.5m, the eaves level matching that of the host dwelling and being under a pitched roof finished in matching roof materials, its ridge sitting below the level of the ridge of the main roof. The materials and finish of the walls and the windows and doors of the extension would all match those of the host dwelling.
14. The appellant has provided numerous examples of other such forms of development within the area, and some of these examples were observed during my site visit. However, I do not have the full information of those cases to make a full assessment, and each appeal must be determined on its own merits.
15. The proposal would enlarge the existing property significantly, but not to the extent that it would be out of keeping with the general pattern of surrounding development. However, the visible portion of development which fronts the highway, and which would be readily visible from the public realm would be more restricted. The setting back of the front elevation of the extension, the setting down of its ridge, and the matching of the materials with the existing property all help to blend the proposal with the existing property and with the surrounding area.
16. I have considered Supplementary Planning Document 2: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions. I have found harm because of the overbearing impact on No.7 from the height and extent of the rear projecting element of the extension. However, the extension would appear subservient to the two-storey element of the existing dwelling when viewed from the public realm and would be consistent with the pattern of development in the area. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
17. It therefore follows that in this regard, I find the proposal accords with policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) and policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014), which require, amongst other things, that development should deliver high quality design that contributes positively to an areas character and identity, creates a high-quality environment for future occupiers, and responds appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out above, owing to the harm in relation to the first main issue, I conclude that the appeal proposals would be contrary to the development plan as a whole, and that there are no material considerations that would justify determining other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR