



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3366351

2 Queens Walk, Thornbury, South Gloucestershire BS35 1SR

- 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 James Sienesi against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref. is P25/00734/HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension with extended dormers to the front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension with extended dormers to the front and rear at 2 Queens Walk, Thornbury, South Gloucestershire BS35 1SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. P25/00734/HH and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 999.P5; 999.P4; D1000 P1; D2000 P2; D3000 P1; D4000 P1.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the adjoining property, No. 1 Queens Walk.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached chalet bungalow, one half of the handed pair with No. 1 Queens Avenue. The dwellings stand away from neighbouring properties in the street scene and are symmetrical, with the only noticeable difference being the colour of the window frames and the top edge of the dormers (presumably because of different materials).
4. The appeal scheme is a two-storey extension of 2m width on the western flank of the house and extending to the dwelling's original depth prior to a ground floor rear extension. The scheme would thereby unbalance the pair with the associated loss

of symmetry, and I acknowledge that in many cases such an effect would justify a refusal of permission.

5. However, in this case there are two additional considerations that weigh in favour of the scheme. Firstly, the existing key elements of the existing building would be closely followed including the building line, ridge height, dormer scale and design. And with matching materials these would successfully integrate with the existing building. In essence, the extension would for the most part be seamless, and this continuity of appearance would largely retain the perception of pleasing uniformity to which the Officers Report refers.
6. The loss of the existing balance with No. 1 through the 2m elongation of No. 2 would reduce the existing symmetry and is a disadvantage of the proposal. However, the extension width is a modest proportion of the existing dwelling and is offset by the extension's close integration with the building in terms of design and detailing.
7. The second consideration is the fact that Nos. 1 & 2 Kempton Close on the opposite side of the road are dwellings of the same design as Nos. 1 & 2 Queens Avenue. No 1 Kempton Close was granted permission under reference N8721 for a very similar two-storey side extension to that now applied for in this appeal and this has since been built.
8. I acknowledge that this decision may have pre-dated the current appeal by a considerable period, but nonetheless it exists and is part of the same street scene. And in my view when seen with the attached dwelling it illustrates that the proposal now before me would not cause the harm alleged by the Council in the Notice of Refusal in this appeal, including the imbalance with the front elevation of the other half of the pair.
9. For the reasons explained above, I therefore find that the proposal would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the host dwelling and the adjoining property, No. 1 Queens Walk. There would be no unacceptable conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Council Core Strategy 2006-2027 adopted 2013; Policies PSP1 & PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Council Policies, Sites and Places Plan 2017; the Council's Household Design Guide SPD 2021, or with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
10. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring matching external materials will maintain visual amenity. A condition stipulating that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR