



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3377115

Fairview, Emersons Green Lane South, Emersons Green, South Gloucestershire BS16 7QL

- 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 Smart against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/00957/HH.
 - The development proposed is single storey ground floor extensions: to rear, to front porch and to rear corner to create wrap-around.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. One of the Council's reasons for refusal relates to "inaccuracies and inconsistencies" in the submitted plans and drawings, which the Council contends allow for an unacceptable degree of ambiguity. It seems to me that if the plans do not accurately reflect either the existing building or the proposed development, that the Council should not have accepted the application. Nonetheless, it proceeded to determine the application and the second reason for refusal relates to the acceptability of the scheme. While I agree that there are errors within the submitted plans and drawings, in the interests of fairness to the appellant, I have considered the merits of the proposed development.
3. The Council, within the Officer Report, outline the inconsistencies as:
 - The proposed block plan does not show the flat roof rear extension
 - The proposed block plan does not accurately show the depth of the side and front extensions
 - A conservatory that has been removed is only shown in the existing west elevation.
 - An existing chimney is not shown in the proposed front elevation however is shown in the proposed side elevations
4. For clarity, I agree the block plan does not accurately show the depth of the rear extension, I have therefore considered the details shown on the submitted elevations and floor plan. It appears to me that the side and front extensions are appropriately shown on the block plan. I agree that the conservatory is only shown on an existing west elevation, however as this had been removed at the time of my site visit and the proposed side extension would replace this in any event, I do not consider this omission is material to my decision. While there is an inconsistency in respect of the chimney, the Council's refusal reason in respect of the merits of

the proposed scheme does not raise issue with this element and so it also would not materially affect the outcome of the appeal.

5. Additionally, the appellant has submitted revised plans with the appeal reducing the extent of the extensions but not addressing the inaccuracies. However, as the Council has not had the opportunity to comment on these, I have not considered them. I have based my decision on the plans submitted to and considered by the Council.
6. The appellant asserts that some of the proposed works comprise permitted development. It is not within the scope of this appeal to determine whether or not that is the case. Nonetheless, the description of development as set out on the application form refers to extensions to the front, side and rear and thus planning permission is sought for all of these works. I have therefore considered the entirety of the submitted scheme.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

8. The scheme proposes extensions to the front, side, and rear of the property. To the front, there would most notably be a new, large, pitched roof porch addition. This accommodates two centrally positioned doors, with glazed panels either side, and additional areas of wall to each side of these elements. As a result, it would appear as an overly wide addition to the front elevation. It would overwhelm the façade and appear as an overly dominant and assertive feature of the property. I note that the front elevation is rather long in its extent, however the roof line is broken, and a portion of front elevation is taken up by a lean-to element which serves to shorten the appearance of the overall elevation. As a result, the section where the porch is proposed appears as a shorter part of the façade, emphasising the width and incongruity of the proposed porch.
9. To the side, a single storey, hipped-roof extension is proposed. The Council state that this would have a width of 5.45 metres. It is noted that this is below the advised 50% of the width of the total dwelling, as advocated within the Council's supplementary planning document. Nonetheless, this is guidance and given the length of the front elevation, an extension of below 50% of this length has the potential to appear disproportionate. Given the truncated appearance of part of the front elevation that I have already referred to, the proposed extension would have an overly wide appearance, when viewed from the front.
10. In terms of the rear extension, this would extend across the entire length of the rear elevation of the dwelling and to the rear of the proposed side extension. The Council highlight that this would be almost 19 metres in length. When considered with the single, flat roof that would sit over the entire addition, the rear extension would appear as a discordant addition, insensitively extending across the entirety of the length of the property. It would fail to respect the scale and form of the existing dwelling.

11. There are views of the dwelling from the nearby public right of way to the front of the site and within this context, the additions would be visible and would have a negative effect on the appearance of the area.
12. There is some irregularity to the pattern of the fenestration within the scheme. However, given the lack of symmetry within the existing dwelling, this does not give rise to any unacceptable visual effect. Nonetheless, this does not overcome the harm I have described.
13. Accordingly, I find that while not extensive enough to harm the wider character of the area, the proposals would harm the appearance of the host property and the appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted December 2013) and policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted November 2017). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development respects the distinctiveness of a site, that development responds constructively to buildings, and that extensions respect scale, form, and proportion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR