



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: 09 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3367059

21 Wolfridge Ride, Alveston, South Gloucestershire BS35 3RA

- 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 & Mrs L Cole against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application reference is P25/00125/HH.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey extension to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey extension to the front elevation at 21 Wolfridge Ride, Alveston, South Gloucestershire, BS35 3RA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P25/00125/HH, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no COL/1127/PL/12/24/002/F (Proposed Plans & Elevations + Location Maps).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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 property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated in a residential area. The street scene is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached, single-storey and two-storey dwellings. While front extensions are limited in the area, I observed on my site visit that the dwellings vary in appearance and are set within a staggered building line. These factors contribute to a mixed street scene overall. The appeal property forms half of a pair which are already visually unbalanced through extensions to both properties, including the front porch extension at the appeal property. Furthermore, the semi-detached pair opposite the

appeal site is also unbalanced due in part to a sizeable front canopy extension at one of the pair. Unbalanced pairs of semi-detached dwellings are therefore an established part of the street scene. In this context, the host dwelling is in keeping with the overall mix of dwellings in the locality and thus contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. Despite its siting on the front elevation of the host dwelling, given the modest depth and height of the proposed single storey front extension, it would appear as a subservient addition which would not dominate the principal elevation. With its design and materials which would be in keeping with the existing porch, the extension would not be an incongruous or discordant feature. Furthermore, it would not harm the balance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings since they are already noticeably unbalanced, including to the ground floor front elevation. The proposed extension would therefore be sympathetic to the appearance of the host dwelling, and it would respect the varied street scene overall.
6. The proposed single storey front extension would also conform to the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2021), since, for the reasons I have explained, it would not dominate the public façade or be incongruous with the character of the host dwelling. Furthermore, although the extension would be wide when combined with the existing front porch, it would still be set in from the side boundary to the neighbouring property and it would not span the full width of the front elevation. The extension would therefore successfully integrate with the characteristics of the existing dwelling and would be in accordance with the SPD.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would comply with Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies Sites and Places Plan (2017) and Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013). Amongst other matters, these policies require that developments respect the architectural style of the site and street scene and respond constructively to the buildings and characteristics that make a positive contribution to the locality.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that a third-party representation raised concerns that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbours, in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, as well as negative impacts on views, natural light and property values. However, the extension would not overlook neighbouring properties since it would not have any side facing windows. Furthermore, due to the modest depth of the extension and it being set in from the boundary, it would not result in an unacceptable effect in terms of overshadowing and a loss of natural light. Whether or not the proposal would have a negative impact on property values, this is generally an issue which relates to private interests and is not determinative on the appeal overall which is based on the planning merits of the scheme. For these reasons, I agree with the Council that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
9. The appeal site is located in the Green Belt. The impact of the proposed development on the Green Belt or its openness is not a matter in dispute between the main parties. In that regard, considering the limited scale of the proposed

extension as well as the Green Belt policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and the development plan, I have no reason to form a different view.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions. The plans condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. The materials condition is also necessary to ensure that the development respects the character and appearance of the area.
11. I also note the comments from the Council's Environmental Protection Contaminated Land Officer, regarding the potential for landfill and ground gas and the hazard to human health. However, there is no request before me for a condition in relation to this matter and there is insufficient information before me to conclude that such a condition would be necessary if allowing the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would comply with the development plan and there are no other material considerations which would alter this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR