
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: 07 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3367108

54 Jubilee Drive, Thornbury, South Gloucestershire BS35 2YH

- 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 and Mrs Crowe against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/00230/HH.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side & rear wrap around extension to widen garage and enlarge dining room.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling situated in a residential area. The area is mostly characterised by dwellings which are of a consistent scale and appearance, primarily formed of dual-pitched roofs and brick elevations. The appeal property is at the end of Jubilee Drive and is adjacent to a public footpath. The footpath features trees, hedges and grass verges which provide a visual relief to the buildings and contributes positively to an open character. A brick boundary wall runs between the footpath and the dwellings, and this marks an important transition from the buildings to the open space. Although the host dwelling already features a side extension near the footpath, it is set in from the brick boundary wall which emphasises the green space along the footpath. Therefore, in its current form, the appeal property is generally sympathetic to its surroundings and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. I acknowledge that the Council are concerned that the width of the proposed side extension combined with the existing protrusion would be more than half the width of the primary mass of the host dwelling. While this conflicts with the guidance contained within the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2021), since the proposed extension would be single storey and

its front section would have a dual-pitched roof to match the existing protrusion, this element would appear sympathetic to the principal elevation of the host dwelling.

6. Nevertheless, due to the excessive scale of the flat roof rear section of the proposed extension, this element would appear as a bulky and disproportionate addition to the host dwelling and would contrast with its original form. The contrast is exemplified in the sideways protrusion of the flat-roof extension, which, although only a small amount, would appear as an incongruous feature set against the more considered pitched roofs used elsewhere in the property. Moreover, due to the siting of both the dual-pitched and flat roof sections of the extensions which would be built to the boundary, it would have a dominant and conspicuous presence when experienced from the public footpath.
7. The extension's prominent siting on the boundary would undermine the important transition to the open space at the footpath, and this would detract from the open character of the site and its immediate setting. The contemporary design of the extension, as well as the use of matching materials would not be sufficient to successfully assimilate the extension with its surroundings.
8. While the appellant states that numerous properties along the footpath have been extended and have provided some photographs to that extent, this contrasts with my own observations from my site visit. On my site visit it was evident that even if dwellings along the footpath have been extended, the dwellings are still physically separate from the boundary wall and are set in from the footpath. Likewise, the photographs provided do not seem to show any similar extensions which form the boundary to the footpath, and I saw no such examples on my visit. Consequently, I am not convinced that there are examples of similar developments in the area which would justify the appeal proposal.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (2013) and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017). Amongst other matters, these policies require that developments respect the character of the site and surrounding area and respond positively to the characteristics which make a particularly positive contribution to the locality.
10. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that developments add to the overall quality of the area. It would also be contrary to the SPD which seeks extensions that respect the characteristics of the existing dwelling and respond constructively to the characteristics of the street scene that are considered to make a positive contribution to the locality.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that planning permission was granted for a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension to the appeal property in 2004. While I accept that the current proposal seems modest compared to what was previously approved, it was approved over twenty years ago in a different planning policy context and before the adoption of the current development plan. The evidence before me also indicates that that proposal was never implemented. Consequently, I can only afford that proposal limited weight, and it does not justify the current appeal proposal.

12. The appellant also refers to the possibility of a prior notification for an 8m deep full width extension via permitted development. However, I have no plans of such a development in order to make a full comparison with the appeal scheme. Moreover, if such an extension would be built to the rear of the dwelling as alluded to, it would not be built to the boundary and would therefore likely avoid some of the harm which I have identified. For these reasons, the prospect of a permitted development proposal as put forward does not justify the harm of the proposal.
13. While it is the appellant's desire to create additional facilities for the family, this is a largely private benefit and there may be other ways of providing additional living space without causing the harm identified.
14. I also understand the appellant's concerns regarding the way in which the Council worked with the appellant on the planning application, including a lack of communication, opportunity for amendments and value for money. Even so, these are not matters which alter my conclusion on the appeal overall which is based on the planning merits of the proposal.
15. I note that, as the appellant has referred, there were no objections received from the occupants of any neighbouring properties. The absence of objections is, however, a neutral factor in the balance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, which would outweigh this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR