

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by John Felgate BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/16/3165772

2 Hopetoun Road, St Werburghs, Bristol BS2 9YL

- 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 & Mrs Jencks against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04319/H, dated 9 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is "*construction of a single storey rear extension, and a roof extension with associated roof terrace*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey rear extension and a roof extension with associated roof terrace, at 2 Hopetoun Road, St Werburghs, Bristol BS2 9YL, in accordance with the application Ref 16/04319/H, dated 9 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
019-PL-020, revision 02
019-PL-021, revision 02
019-PL-022, revision 02
019-PL-023, revision 02
019-PL-024, revision 02
 - 3) No above-ground development shall take place until details and samples of all external facing materials have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved.
 - 4) The roof area of the proposed ground floor extension shall not at any time be used as a balcony, roof garden, terrace or similar amenity area

Main issue

2. The Council raises no objection to the proposed rear extension. The main issue in the appeal is therefore the effect of the proposed roof extension on the area's character and appearance.

Reasons for decision

3. The appeal property is an end-of terrace, 2-storey house, with its front facing onto Hopetoun Road and its side elevation to Watercress Road. The proposed
-

roof extension would replace the existing roof with a new structure containing a second floor bedroom, bathroom and roof terrace.

4. The proposed design would contrast strongly with the existing terrace, in its form, materials and contemporary style. The gabled end with its deep overhang, large glazed screen and balustrade, would be a more assertive feature than the hipped corner that exists now. The timber cladding would be different in appearance from the slate roofs of the remainder of the terrace. But nonetheless, the design has an elegant simplicity about it. It also imparts a sense of boldness and confidence.
5. Such a departure from the style of the original building would not necessarily be acceptable everywhere. However, as I saw on my visit, Hopetoun Road forms part of a distinct enclave, including Watercress Lane, Mina Road, Boling Wells Lane and The Yard, which is separated from the remainder of the city by open land, and where there is a very lively and unusual mixture of architectural styles. Within this area, amongst and alongside the original Victorian terraces, there is a variety of other extensions in modern designs and materials, together with a large number of uncompromisingly modern buildings, including examples of surrealist design and detailing, and also a number of quite striking painted murals.
6. In such exuberant surroundings, the proposed roof extension at the appeal site would not be out of place. Indeed it would represent a high-quality design, which responds well to its context, and contributes positively to the area's identity and distinctiveness. In all these respects, it would accord with the stated aims of Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy, adopted in June 2011, and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, adopted in July 2011.

Other matters and conclusion

7. I note the concerns raised by neighbours regarding privacy and loss of light. But in these respects the roof extension now proposed would be no worse than the alternative scheme for which a certificate of lawful development has already been granted. I see no reason to doubt that this is a realistic fall-back option which would be built if the appeal proposal were refused, and I therefore give this significant weight.
8. I also note concerns regarding the possible use of the roof of the proposed ground floor extension as a roof terrace, but that is not what is currently proposed. In any case, such use can be prevented by condition, and in granting permission I have imposed condition 4 to this effect. Moreover, in the light of this condition, it is unnecessary to require any screening.
9. I have also imposed conditions with regard to materials, to ensure a satisfactory appearance, and requiring compliance with the approved plans, for the purposes of certainty and proper planning. Given the nature of the proposals, it is appropriate that the materials condition requires further details to be agreed, rather than to match the existing building.
10. Subject to these conditions, the appeal is allowed in the terms set out above.

John Felgate

INSPECTOR