
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by David L Morgan BA MA (T&CP) MA (Bld Con IoAAS) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/16/3163201

3, Haverstock Road, Totterdown, Bristol BS4 2DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Fear against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04816/H, dated 6 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is retrospective planning approval for new attic level rear dormer and room in the roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area.

Procedural matter

3. It is evident from the description of the scheme and from my site visit that the development has taken place. The development as constructed however differs in minor detail to that described in the submitted drawings. The en-suite bathroom window to the east elevation is longer than that on the drawing and the balustrade is formed of steel and frosted glass rather than the painted metal illustrated on the drawing. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the drawings presented with it and this is reflected in the reasoning set out below.

Reasons

4. No 3 Haverstock Road is one of a terrace of substantial later C19 dwellings located on the elevated ground to the west of the Wells Road. Together with Brecknock and Fairfoot Roads Haverstock Road forms a visually cohesive residential enclave of broadly the same architectural character and date.
5. The terraces of the enclave are generally well preserved, though I noted a number of attic dormers in the rear pitches of dwellings in Haverstock Road (Nos 17 and 21) and on the semi-detached dwellings on the west side of the Wells Road (Nos 179 and 181).
6. The development comprises an addition to the rear of the roof structure which finishes below the axial ridge, extends to midway across the raised copings of the party walls defining the terraced houses and the base of which sits

effectively on the wall head of the rear elevation of the house. With sheer rear and flank walls and flat roof it in effect forms a full attic storey extension to the rear of the property. It is clad in close-boarded horizontally set Cedar cladding which extends below and in front of the rear wall head. There is a three-light set of doors fronted with a Juliette-type balcony fixed to the rear face of the extension. Adjacent there is a vertical window opening lighting the en-suite bathroom.

7. Because of its maximised proportions and flat roofed form the extension occupies the full register of the former rear roof pitch. There is therefore no sense of the pre-existing profile or form of the traditional rear roof pitch remaining. This strident and bulky structure can therefore be seen in awkward and discordant contrast with the rear roof pitches of the adjacent terraced dwellings and those others of the terrace in proximity to them. This awkward sense of alien otherness is amplified by the colour and tone of the newly finished Cedar, which again stands in challenging contrast with the more subtle pallet of materials evident in the construction of these dwellings.
8. These deleterious attributes would be clearly apparent to occupiers in the adjacent terraces and to those observing from the wider public domain. The extension can be clearly viewed in the gap between the rear of the dwellings fronting the Wells Road and those forming the southern terrace of Brecknock Road, from Fairfoot Road and in the gap between Nos 177 and 179 on the Wells Road.
9. As a result the extension harms both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area and is thus in conflict with policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (June 2011), which amongst other things seeks to deliver high quality design and development that contributes positively to an areas character and identity.
10. For the same reasons it would also be contrary to Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (July 2014), as well as guidance contained with Supplementary Planning Guidance Document 2: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (October 2005) which collectively seek similar aims, including detailed expectations on extensions, which anticipate appropriate scale, proportions, materials and siting of such development. The design guidance also includes clear expectations on the form of roof extensions considered appropriate.
11. I have given consideration to the point made by the appellant that the extension was intended as permitted development under Class B of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 and that it only misses being interpreted as such by limited criteria. These are identified as being as a result of the materials used to clad the extension and the fact that the rear elevation of the structure does is not set back a minimum of 0.2 meters from the eaves when measured along the roof slope from the outside edge of the eaves.
12. However, the parameters of what may be considered permitted development (and what is not) are set for a clear planning purpose. In the particulars of this case the provisions of Class B are defined to ensure that any permitted structure is set back within the plain of the roof pitch, establishing its subservience to the main body of the structure below. The extension, as it is built, fails to achieve this necessary degree of subservience and the result is a

large, unbalanced structure that causes a degree of material harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

13. I also acknowledge that the Cedar cladding will, in the course of time weather-down and the structure will become less visually strident as a consequence. Nevertheless, the timber cladding at this level would still stand in discernable contrast to the establish pallet of materials in its environs. Again the purpose of the provision of Class B in this regard is to ensure a broad degree of continuity and compliance with established character and appearance to mitigate against potential harm to the visual amenity of the area. So, whilst I acknowledge the points made by the appellant in this regard, though material, they do not merit sufficient weight to change my view on the harm the proposals cause, or their conflict with the policies of the development plan that ensues.

Other matters

14. I have considered the concerns of adjacent occupiers with regard to the effect of the development on their living conditions with specific regard to loss of privacy. I do accept that the presence of the three light doors and Juliette balcony in the rear elevation are a discernable presence when viewed from the rear gardens of properties in Brecknock Road and this may lead to the perception of a degree of overlooking. However, with screening provision to the balustrade (which could be achieved through condition) the degree of oversight here would not amount to more than that from a normal window. Moreover, the balcony makes no provision for occupiers to sit out thereon and given the combined distances involved, I do not consider there would be any degree of overlooking sufficient to cause material harm to living conditions of adjacent occupiers.
15. For the reasons given above, and having taken careful account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Morgan

Inspector