



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3367132

3 Stean Bridge Road, Bradley Stoke, South Gloucestershire BS32 8AH

- 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 Ashley Lyne against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application reference is P25/00197/HH.
 - The development proposed is described as 'to demolish the existing rear and side extensions and erect a new double-storey rear extension and a new double-storey side extension, and garage conversion together with internal alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. On my site visit I viewed the appeal property from Stean Bridge Road and Hales Horn Close, as well as from the rear garden of 1 Hales Horn Close (No 1). While I was unable to gain access to the rear garden of the appeal dwelling on my visit, given the site's corner plot location, I was able to see the rear elevation from Hales Horn Close. Furthermore, I have seen the photograph of the rear elevation provided in the appellant's Design and Access Statement. For these reasons, based on my observations from my site visit as well as the evidence contained within the submitted documents, I am satisfied that I have sufficient information to assess the appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - i) character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - ii) living conditions of occupiers of No 1, in terms of privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling which is situated in a modern housing estate. The estate is mostly characterised by detached dwellings

which despite some variances to their individual design, are generally consistent in terms of their scale, form and materials. Where dwellings have been extended in the estate, extensions typically appear subservient in scale and tend to respect the design and massing of their host dwelling. As the host dwelling is generally of a similar scale and appearance to the dwellings nearby, it makes a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the appeal site occupies a corner plot at Stean Bridge Road and Hales Horn Close. It is therefore in a prominent position in the estate which is visible from multiple vantage points.

6. Despite their position within the boundary of the appeal property, due to the substantial scale and the wraparound design of the proposed double storey side and rear extensions, they would amount to excessive additions which would dominate the scale and form of the host dwelling. The site's prominent corner plot location would further emphasise the bulk and mass of the extensions, where the resulting dwelling would appear disproportionate in comparison to those in the vicinity. Furthermore, the unsympathetic double gable design of the rear extension would jar with the otherwise coherent form of the host dwelling and the other dwellings nearby. The use of matching materials would not be sufficient to successfully assimilate the extensions with the host dwelling and the wider surroundings. Consequently, the extensions would not be subservient to the host dwelling and would appear incongruous in the area.
7. The appellant refers to some planning applications which they state have been approved for similar or larger extensions in the area. However, this contrasts with my observations on my site visit where extensions generally appeared subservient in scale and in keeping with their host dwellings. The examples referred to in the appellant's Design and Access Statement are all from some time ago when the planning policy context was likely different to that in which I am considering the current appeal. Furthermore, there is insufficient evidence before me to indicate that any of these examples occupy prominent corner plots, as is the case for the appeal scheme. Consequently, in my view, none of the examples referred to by the appellant justify the proposed extensions.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (CS) (2013) and Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSPP) (2017), which amongst other matters, require that the scale and proportions of developments respect the character of the site and the surrounding area.

Living conditions

9. The rear garden of the appeal property is of a modest depth and shares a boundary with the rear garden of No 1. No 1 is a two-storey detached dwelling with its rear elevation facing towards the rear elevation of the appeal property. On my site visit, I observed the appeal site from the rear garden of No 1, which is also of a modest depth. The boundary between the properties is formed of a wooden panel fence which runs all the way along the rear boundary between the properties. There is also some planting along the boundary, but this does not provide any significant screening.

10. I accept that the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling already contains first floor windows which face in the direction of the rear garden of No 1. However, the first-floor bedroom windows of the proposed double storey rear extension would be sited much closer to the rear garden of No 1. Consequently, views from the proposed bedroom windows of the appeal dwelling into the rear garden of No 1 and towards the habitable rooms in the rear would be much more noticeable and direct than the existing arrangement. This proposed arrangement would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupiers of No 1.
11. While the appellant would be willing to use obscure glazing, this would not be a suitable compromise since it would result in unacceptable living conditions at the new first-floor bedrooms at the appeal property. In addition, whether or not the appellant could adjust the window positions of the rear extension, this would not be a sufficient solution, given that the appeal procedure should not generally be used to evolve a scheme.
12. I also acknowledge that shadow sketches for December and June have been submitted as part of the appeal. However, while it was raised by third parties, whether or not the proposal would have any impact on light to neighbouring properties does not form part of the Council's reasons for refusal. Consequently, these documents are not determinative on this main issue.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No 1, in terms of privacy. The proposal would conflict with Policy PSP8 of the PSPP, which amongst other matters, requires that developments do not create unacceptable living conditions of occupiers of nearby properties including loss of privacy and overlooking.
14. On this matter, the Council also refer to conflict with Policy CS1 of the CS, however, this policy relates to design quality. The Council also refer to conflict with Policy PSP43 of the PSPP, but this policy relates to private amenity space standards for new residential units. I therefore find no conflict with these policies on this main issue. However, this does not overcome the aforementioned conflict with Policy PSP8 of the PSPP and the harm to living conditions.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge that the appellant has concerns regarding the lack of opportunity for engagement, amendments and communication, matters which are generally supported in the National Planning Policy Framework. While I accept that this is frustrating for the appellant, these are not land use planning matters which alter my conclusions which are based on the planning merits of the proposed development. Furthermore, although the appellant is open to minor amendments to the proposal, as I have already explained, the appeal process should not normally be used to evolve a scheme.
16. I am also conscious that the planning application was submitted following the Council's refusal of a previous planning application for a similar development and in response to pre-application advice. However, even if the proposal has been amended in light of previous concerns, my recommendation is based on the plans on which the Council made their decision.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed since it would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations which would alter this finding.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR