
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Mike Fox BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 January 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/16/3162262

2 Quantock Road, Bedminster, Bristol, BS3 4PF

- 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 Mrs Bev Hunwicks against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03107/H, dated 7 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is an additional storey to create additional bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an additional storey to create additional bedrooms at 2 Quantock Road, Bedminster, Bristol, BS3 4PF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/03107/H, dated 7 June 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed General Arrangements, Elevations and Block Plans, Ref PL02 A, dated June 2016.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located at the lower end of a terrace of six dwellings within a high density residential area in a hilly part of Bristol. The proposed development would increase the height of the building by about 2.1m, amounting to a three storey and almost flat-roofed extension. The Council's concern is that this would not follow the prevailing pattern of the roof form and as such would appear as an incongruous feature in the streetscene and having a poor relationship with the host dwelling, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of both the existing property and the surrounding area.

4. The proposed development would have a pitched roof facing the street, and whilst this would represent a departure from the neighbouring flat roofs in the rest of the terrace, there are several examples where this has been achieved in the vicinity of the appeal property without resulting in significant visual harm. The proposed design would take the appearance of a mansard roof extension, some of which would not be observable at street level, being partially concealed behind the existing parapet wall. It would not appear either unduly prominent or alien to the scale and design of the building as a whole. Rather, it would appear unobtrusive in the streetscene. It would be subservient to the existing host structure and overall, would be a modest addition to the dwelling. Its visual impact on both the existing building and the streetscene would be neutral.
5. I accept that the proposal would be visible from the rear, where it would be seen in the context of a wide variety of roof forms. I consider, however, that even from the rear it would not stand out as alien to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Taking account of the above considerations, I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and streetscene or the wider area. As such it would not conflict with national policy as expressed in Section 7 of *the Framework*¹, and neither would it be contrary to policy DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan which sets the overall design principles relating to alterations to existing buildings.
7. The Council has not suggested any additional conditions to those which appear in the standard questionnaire, and neither do I.
8. In conclusion, I find that the proposal, which would provide social benefits in terms of enhanced accommodation for the existing household, would be a relatively modest addition to the host property. It would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene, nor the wider area from the rear. It therefore would not be contrary to national policy or the development plan. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mike Fox

INSPECTOR

¹ DCLG: National Planning Policy Framework (*the Framework*); March 2012.