



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3365586**

**The Bungalow, Lea Gate, Bagstone Road, Rangeworthy, South Gloucestershire  
GL12 8BD**

- 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 Shaun Fisher against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
  - The application reference is P25/00505/HH.
  - The development proposed is for a single storey side extension and new dormer windows to rear of roof slope. Resubmission of previously refused scheme with previously proposed front dormers removed.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. There is a minor discrepancy in respect of the plans, but I have enough detail before me to form the basis of my overall planning assessment. Had I been allowing the appeal, I would have pursued this matter further with the parties, including a request for accurate plans.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
  - The character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
  - The living conditions of the existing occupiers of Myrtle Cottage, with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The area is characterised by dwellings of varying scale, design and age, lining both sides of Bagstone Road. The host dwelling is set back behind frontage development. It was formerly an outbuilding within the garden of another home, Lea Gate.
5. The proposal would extend into an area of garden to the side of the appeal dwelling. It would appear as a continuation of the existing building with the same ridge and eaves heights, and gabled roof form. The side extension would neither be set back from the existing principal elevation, or the ridge set down from the existing roof height. It would also extend outwards more than half of the width of the principal elevation. As a result, the proposal would not appear subservient to

the host dwelling. Furthermore, its scale, height and mass would appear as an incongruously large extension to what is otherwise a modest dwelling.

6. I therefore find that the proposal would not accord with the provisions of 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). These require that the scale, height and massing, amongst other things, are informed by, respect, and enhance the character and distinctiveness of both the site and its context.
7. In reaching this finding, I have had regard to guidance contained within the South Gloucestershire Householder Design Guide SPD (2021) specific to the design of side extensions. This Guide advises that such extensions should be subservient in height to the host dwelling, not more than half of its width, and set back from the principal elevation.

### *Living conditions*

8. In considering the effect on outlook, it is noted that the existing appeal dwelling sits to the rear of Myrtle Cottage's garden, its presence being tempered by being largely behind the latter's outbuilding. The proposed extension changes this relationship, extending to the rear of the gap between this outbuilding and Myrtle Cottage itself.
9. The proposal by reason of its mass and overall scale, in close proximity to the boundary with Myrtle Cottage, would appear overbearing, dominant and oppressive when viewed from Myrtle Cottage's garden, which would adversely affect the outlook for occupiers of this garden.
10. The proposal would introduce rooflights to the extended roof plane facing Myrtle Cottage. Neither party has produced evidence to demonstrate that views would be possible out of these rooflights into Myrtle Cottage's garden or into the dwelling itself. Given the position of the proposed rooflights within the roof plane, the degree of overlooking afforded is unlikely to be of a scale to be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of Myrtle Cottage.
11. Nevertheless, given the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Myrtle Cottage derived from the overbearing, dominant and oppressive presence of the proposed extension, I find that it would not accord with the provisions of policies PSP8 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017). These advise that developments should not have unacceptable impacts on living conditions, including as a result of a proposal being overbearing or dominant. Again, I have had regard to the South Gloucestershire Householder Design Guide SPD (2021) in reaching this finding.

### **Other Matters**

12. The proposal would allow the appellant's partner to move in, which would mean they could vacate a social rented dwelling. Whilst, this would be a benefit, I have no mechanism to ensure that is the case and is a matter to which I give very limited weight. Furthermore, the proposed development would endure far beyond the period applicable to these circumstances. I therefore find this consideration is not sufficient to outweigh the identified harm and consequent conflict with the development plan.

13. There is also reference in the appellant's statement expressing concerns about lack of engagement and the Local Planning Authority not working positively and proactively with them. However, these are not matters for my deliberation in the context of a planning appeal.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, relating to both harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the living conditions of the occupiers of Myrtle Cottage, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*S Sharp*

INSPECTOR