



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3366431

11 Willow Grove, Bristol BS16 4LB

- 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 Nadine Najar against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/11230/H.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey side extension (part at rear) and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 12 Willow Grove, with specific reference to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within a residential cul-de-sac comprising semi-detached houses, some of which have been extended over time. 8 and 12 Willow Grove have two storey set-back side extensions with hipped roofs which are integrated into their main roofs. Woodland Close is another residential street located immediately to the rear of the appeal site which consequently has two public facing elevations.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 entitled 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (October 2005) (SPD) sets out a number of design guidelines. In terms of general points, the SPD, in section 5.1 highlights that any alterations or extensions should generally respect, but not necessarily mimic, the style and appearance of the house, and the character of the locality, in relation to, amongst other things, built form, scale and proportions; and roof form.
5. Furthermore, SPD section 5.5 states that successful extensions usually appear subservient to the original house and that over large extensions can affect the visual quality of an area. As a general rule, to minimise the visual impact on the street, extensions should be located on the least prominent elevations and, ideally at the rear. Clearly this is a guide and not one that can be applied particularly

successfully to the appeal proposal due to its dual aspect. Paragraph 5.5 goes on to state that to retain the existing character and appearance of a property, the style, roof pitch, windows and building materials used on an extension should generally match or respect those of the existing building.

6. It is quite clear that a number of design cues that have been taken from the host dwelling, however, rather than integrating the roof of the two storey side extension into the main roof, it would appear as an almost standalone structure from all angles. A significant proportion of the two storey extension would project beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling and combined with the single-storey kitchen element would be built in very close proximity to the rear garden boundary adjacent to Woodland Close. This would significantly erode the amount of private amenity space for that dwelling, particularly important for a proposed 5no bedroom dwelling which it is understood that the appellant seeks to utilise to accommodate foster children. Whilst I wholeheartedly respect the appellant's intention, occupancy of a dwelling is transitory and the benefits arising from the proposal do not outweigh the visual harm that would ensue to the character and appearance of the area through what I consider to be an overdevelopment of the appeal dwelling and its curtilage.
7. The SPD stipulates with regards to loss of amenity space that extensions should maintain a usable garden area to allow practical use and reflect the established character of the area and size of house. The loss of such space should be minimised, particularly as extensions frequently allow for an increase in the number of residents living at a property. This supports my view above.
8. Overall, I consider that by virtue of the scale of the proposal that it would fail to be subservient to the existing dwelling and whilst I have had regard to the Permitted Development fallback situation, extensions that could be constructed under such rights would in no way resemble the overall scale of the proposal before me, particularly over two storeys and therefore I give such considerations limited weight. All in all I consider that the proposal, by virtue of its overall scale and comprising a multitude of roof forms, would constitute an incongruous and dominant addition which fails to respect the character, proportions and symmetry of the host dwelling giving rise to an overdevelopment of the plot and causing demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. I find the proposal conflicts with Policy BSC21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) which together require new development in Bristol to deliver high quality urban design; and where concerning extensions and alterations to existing buildings, expect proposals to respect the siting, scale, form, proportions and the overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene; requiring extensions to be physically and visually subservient to the host building, including its roof form and not dominate it. As I have found above, the scheme also conflicts with the general spirit of the SPD.

Living Conditions

10. No12 has a quite substantial two storey side extension with no windows on the facing elevation. The western flank elevation of the proposed extension would taper away from the shared boundary such that both dwellings are well over 45° from each other in terms of their orientation. I acknowledge that the two storey

element of the side extension could be slightly overbearing of the side garden of no12, however that property also has a quite reasonable area of rear garden and therefore I find that the outlook from the private external amenity space of the neighbouring property would not be unduly harmed by the proposal.

11. Furthermore, it is quite possible that a greater degree of overshadowing of the side garden of no12 would be caused, but in reality, that would only be for a relatively short period in the morning and I consider that the Council has not substantiated that there would be a material level of overshadowing caused by the proposal. However, the lack of material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents does not outweigh the harm that I have found in respect of the character and appearance of the area, and I say this acknowledging the appellant's frustration with regards to a lack of communication from the Council. However, ultimately, that does not alter my conclusions on the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR