



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by **G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3374450

22 Abbots Road, Hanham, South Gloucestershire, BS15 3NG

- 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 Purnell against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/01681/HH.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension to form additional living accommodation and erection of front porch (part amendment to previously approved scheme P23/02463/HH (re-submission of P25/00769/HH) (Retrospective)).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development from the decision notice as this is more concise.
3. There is a complex planning history which is relevant to this appeal, and I have therefore summarised my understanding of the relevant aspects below.
4. Planning permission was granted for, amongst other elements, a two storey side extension under Ref P23/01464/HH. The approved side extension involved a hipped roof linking into the existing hipped roof on the host property. No porch extension was shown. This was followed by a split permission Ref P23/02463/HH for a larger rear extension with the existing plans showing the original hipped roof to the host extended to a gable end and the proposed two storey side extension with a gable and not hip end. The latter was refused permission as part of the split decision. No porch extension was shown.
5. I understand that the hip to gable extension on the host's original roof and a new rear dormer were then constructed and completed on site and that there is some agreement to these works constituting permitted development. That is not a matter that I can comment on in relation to an appeal that seeks planning permission and I note that no Lawful Development Certificate has been obtained. Even so, I have proceeded on the basis that the hip to gable end extension to the original roof to the host is not before me and that it appears to be permitted development.
6. The appeal follows the resubmission of Ref 25/00769/HH, the latter for a similar hip to gable two storey extension that was refused in June 2025. The appeal involves broadly the same two storey side extension with a gable end and the retention of a porch, as built. I have determined the appeal on the above basis.

Main Issue

7. Whilst there are two reasons for refusal both relate to the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. I have therefore dealt with them as one issue.

Reasons

8. The appeal site comprises one half of a pair of semi-detached properties located on Abbotts Road. The other half of the semi is 20 Abbotts Road (No.20). To the south east is a detached two storey gable fronted property, 24 Abbotts Road (No.24). To the north west and south east are a mixture of semi and detached bungalows and two storey properties mostly with hipped roofs but with some variety in terms of their detailing, form and materials.
9. Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core strategy (CS) and policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSP) seek, amongst other requirements, to ensure that new development is: of a high quality design; responds positively to the characteristics of the area and local distinctiveness; demonstrates that form, scale and height are informed by, respect and enhance the character of the area; and for extensions that they respect the form, scale, proportions, architectural style/detailing, and materials of the host property and the surrounding area. These policies remain consistent with those in paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
10. Dealing firstly with the proposed two storey side extension, as I confirmed earlier, the principle of an extension in this location has already been established but that approval involved a hipped roof linked to the original hipped roof of the host. In comparison, the appeal involves a gable ended design to the side extension that would not, in my view, be proportional or subservient to the host property. The proposal would also result in an awkward relationship with No.24, particularly its gabled frontage, by introducing a large two storey gable end right up against the common boundary with No.24. As I observed on site, the gable end extension to the original roof, as built, is already visually prominent, a result of the fact that the host appears to sit at a higher level to No.24. The new gable end would be much closer exacerbating the impact on the setting of No.24 and on the streetscene.
11. It would also further unbalance the pair of semis that the host forms part of whereas the approved hipped design integrated well with the host and No.20. The latter was achieved through securing a design that was subservient to the host and the pair of semis. The approved design also retained and did not detract from the character, distinctive features and overall form of the pair.
12. Given the above, this aspect of the appeal proposal would result in a poor standard of design that would be out of character with the site and the streetscene.
13. I accept that hip to gable extensions can be appropriate, successfully designed and are a common way to extend properties to provide additional accommodation. Even so, their success is based on the right site characteristics/location and relationship to neighbours and the wider streetscene. In that respect, the Appellant refers to an example of an approved hip to gable extension at 24 Central Avenue. Having visited that site I am not convinced that this is comparable to the appeal proposal.

14. The Central Avenue streetscene is fairly uniform and largely comprises pairs of semis and some smaller terraces of the same style, scale, form, age and design. There is a consistent built rhythm to the road. There are also consistent gaps between most of the semis. As such, as well as 24 Central Avenue, there are a number of successful hip to gable extensions in the road that have integrated well with their neighbours and the wider streetscene. None of the examples are visually prominent or incongruous and sit comfortably within the streetscene. For these reasons, none of these examples affect my findings on this aspect of the appeal.
15. Turning to the proposed porch, as I confirmed earlier, this has already been built. On the previous approvals the existing front entrance, with curved brick detail and bay window to its side, were shown to be retained. Within the proposal, the bay window has effectively been incorporated into the new porch, with the hipped roof replaced by a mono pitch roof. The latter links into the porch which has a high vertical emphasis with a gable ended roof above. I concur with the Council that the porch is large and bulky and visually dominates the appearance of the frontage to the host and immediate context. This feature does not respond positively to the characteristics or detailing of the original host or the other half of this pair of semis, No.20 and appears out of character.
16. Section 2.4 of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that where the size of a new porch exceeds permitted development rights it will be treated as a front extension. The criteria for the latter seek to ensure that they do not introduce a discordant or inharmonious feature that dominates or appear incongruous. It should also not unbalance the front elevation of double fronted properties or semis. In my view, this aspect of the appeal proposal fails to comply with a number of these criteria. As with the gable ended side extension it results in an awkward relationship with the host and No.20. Indeed, the combined bay window and porch to No.20, with its hipped roof, is an example, in my view, of an alternative more harmonious and appropriate design that could be followed.
17. The Appellant has referred to Figure 24 in the SPD which shows an acceptable example of a new porch on a terraced property. It is not, in my view, comparable in that the figure relates to a terraced property. It is also a much simpler addition with a pitched roof that integrates well with the character of the host and the terrace. As I have found, the proposed porch is not simple, it is large and bulky, and does not integrate well with either the host or No.20.
18. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area contrary to policy CS1 of the CS, policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the PSP, the SPD and the corresponding policies of the NPPF.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR