
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2025

by **M Wiltshire CEng, MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3362625

49 Oakhanger Drive, Lawrence Weston, Bristol BS11 0RJ

- 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 Ras Douglas against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is no:23/04816/H.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extension with additional parking provision.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 47 Oakhanger Drive with regards to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached property in a residential street characterised by mainly uniformly semi-detached residences with single storey side extensions in the gaps between houses. This uniformity of housing development contributes to the sense of regularity of street scene in this locality. Many of the houses, including the appeal site have parking arrangements where there is an element of soft landscaping in the front garden adjacent to a driveway. This provides a pleasant landscape setting to the street.
4. The proposed development seeks to increase the existing side extension from 1 to 2 storeys, as well as add single storey front and rear extensions. The two-storey side extension would enclose the gap between the properties at first floor and roof level harmfully disrupting the general uniformity in the area. The total loss of the area of soft landscaping to car parking along the full frontage of the dwelling would harmfully erode the character of the area derived from areas of soft landscaping.
5. The appellant has sought to design the proposed extensions to be in keeping with the general design and use of materials of the existing and neighbouring properties, whilst also being subservient to the original property. However, these matters would not mitigate or outweigh the overall significant disruption of the

surrounding fairly uniform housing development of the area. The appellant indicates that there are other examples of similar extensions, however these are not so prevalent that the general uniformity, with regular gaps between properties above ground floor level has been significantly degraded. As such this does not indicate that the appeal scheme would be acceptable.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, adopted June 2011 (BCS) and Policies DM23, DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, adopted July 2014 (SADMP). Together, and among other matters, these policies seek to ensure high standards of urban design, which respect local character and distinctiveness in terms of the form, rhythms and patterns of existing development and the broader street scene and ensure parking is integral to the design of the development proposed.
7. The Council has made reference to Policy BCS20 of the BCS. This is a strategic policy that has limited relevance to a development of the type and scale of this appeal scheme.

Living conditions of neighbours with regard to light and outlook

8. The proposed development would be positioned next to 47 Oakhanger Drive (No 47) and would include a two-storey side extension extending to the boundary line.
9. The occupiers of No 47 would perceive the proposed development as a two-storey built form very close to the side of the property. This proximity together with the height would result in an oppressive form of development resulting in an overbearing form of development and a degree of overshadowing and loss of light and outlook. The siting of the proposed development is likely to cause a loss of light to the windows on the side elevation of No 47 that faces No 49.
10. The proposed positioning of windows would prevent any unacceptable overlooking from the appeal extensions and the size and form of the proposed front and rear extensions would not be harmful. However, these aspects of the proposal are neutral matters and cannot mitigate the harm that would arise from the side extension element of the development proposed.
11. Therefore, the development would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 47 Oakhanger Drive with regards to light and outlook. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BCS21 of the BCS and Policy DM30 of the SADMP. Together, and among other matters, these policies seek to ensure high standards of urban design which safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matter

12. The appellant has indicated possible alternative design approaches that could be taken to extend the appeal dwelling. However, this appeal can only focus on the development which was proposed in the original planning application.

Conclusion

13. The benefits that would arise from the appeal scheme would be limited to private benefits for the occupiers of the dwelling. This carries limited weight and does not

outweigh the harm identified above. The development would not accord with the development plan when considered as a whole.

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

M Wiltshire

INSPECTOR