



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3360890

The Bungalow, Grove Lane, Hinton SN14 8HF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stephen Dallow against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02683/PNHA.
 - The development proposed is enlargement of single storey dwellinghouse by construction of 1 no additional storey.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Class AA of Part 1, Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) for the enlargement of single storey dwellinghouse by construction of 1 no additional storey at The Bungalow, Grove Lane, Hinton SN14 8HF, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P24/02683/PNHA, and the plans submitted with it. This approval is subject to the conditions and stipulations as set out under Class AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the header and my decision is taken from the Council's decision notice. The original description on the application form is much longer and it provides superfluous information on the history of the appeal property and other local residences. No injustice would be caused by basing my assessment on the revised and shortened description.
3. Class AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO (Class AA) defines as permitted development the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys, subject to limitations and conditions. The Council accepts the proposal would accord with the stipulations as set out under paragraphs AA.1 and AA.2 (2) of Class AA. However, under paragraph AA.2 (3) there is a requirement for a developer to apply to the local planning authority for prior approval as to a number of specified issues before beginning development. This appeal follows the Council's decision to refuse prior approval. There is no requirement to determine such applications in accordance with the development plan, although in light of sub-paragraph AA.3(12)(b) I have had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it is relevant to my assessment.

Main Issue

4. In light of the Council's submissions, the main issue is whether prior approval should be granted having regard to the development's effect on the external appearance of the dwelling.

Reasons

5. The Bungalow is within a short line of residences with houses also on the opposite side of the road. All the nearby dwellings are of a typical domestic scale with pitched roofs. However, some of the houses have first floor accommodation in roof spaces (such as Gable Rise the neighbouring property to the appeal site) whilst others have eaves above first floor windows. Moreover, the local topography means that dwellings are built at slightly different levels. The Bungalow is set well above the road but it appears unusually low compared to other nearby houses as it is single storey with no fenestration above the eaves.
6. The proposed development would increase the height of the appeal property by raising the eaves and inserting a new storey at first floor level. It would result in the appeal property having higher eaves and a higher roof ridgeline compared to Gable Rise. However, the difference would not be excessive. Also, a gap would be retained between the main parts of the appeal property and Gable Rise so as to avoid an abrupt change in building heights.
7. The resultant building would appear quite tall from the road due to relative ground levels. However, the step up in eaves and ridge heights would reflect the topography as the ground level of The Bungalow is slightly higher than that for Gable Rise. Also, the development would not lead to an overly prominent dwelling as it would retain the proportions of a typical residence and as it would be set back from the road. The main elevation of the appeal property would obviously appear taller but its proportions would remain comparable to other nearby residences. Indeed, the proposal would lead to The Bungalow appearing more consistent with other nearby buildings in terms of eaves and ridge heights.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the external appearance of the building. Also, it would be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment and so it would accord with the provisions of the Framework as set out under paragraph 135.

Other Matters

9. An interested party has raised concerns over the loss of light to Gable Rise as a result of the proposal. However, the 2 properties sit side by side so the additional storey would have no meaningful overshadowing effect on the main front or rear facing windows in Gable Rise. The development would lead to a loss of light to small side windows but I agree with the Council's view that this would not unduly harm living conditions at the neighbouring property.
10. Reference is also made to other developments proposed for The Bungalow. However, limited details are before me on these other schemes. In any event, under the terms of Class AA, my assessment is limited to the acceptability of the appeal development.
11. The concerns raised do not provide justification to refuse prior approval. Therefore, they do not affect my overall conclusion.

Conditions

12. Class AA includes a number of conditions that the proposal would need to accord with in order to constitute permitted development. These include a requirement under sub-paragraph A.A.3 (14) that the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details. There is no need to repeat these conditions as part of this decision as they are set out under the terms of Class AA.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR