
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2017

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

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

Decision date: 21 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/17/3166435
77 Woodacre, Portishead, Bristol BS20 7EH

- 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 Neil Birleson against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/1809/F, dated 5 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is "flue running up from middle floor on front of house. In powder coat black to match drainpipes and black balcony. Works already completed as unaware planning would be required."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The development has already taken place. The main issue is its effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one of a row of terraced townhouses arranged in a crescent. They have three storeys with the occasional front facing gable in the roof slope. They have front first floor covered balconies and, at ground floor level, an integral garage. The matching design and materials give them a very strong uniformity and neatness of appearance.
 4. No.77, the appeal site, has an internal wood burning stove and a flue serving the stove has been erected on the exterior of the building from first floor level, near the top of the covered balcony, up to and protruding above the eaves line. The flue kinks outwards at about eaves level.
 5. The flue is particularly prominent where it rises above the eaves line of the terrace and can, from a number of public viewpoints, be seen against the sky. It is also prominent on the façade. Its diameter clearly distinguishes it from other downpipes along the terrace, as does the fact that it stands slightly away from the wall and kinks outwards as it avoids the overhanging eaves. The fact that it is metal and has been powder coated black reflects some of the materials used in the front elevations of the properties, however, this does not adequately mitigate its contrasting and incongruous appearance. I have borne in mind that
-

the flue is a standard diameter for the type of wood burning stove installed in no.77, however, that does not diminish the harm it does in this location.

6. The eye is drawn to the flue and it significantly detracts from the generally uniform and pleasing character and appearance of the cohesive terrace of modern townhouses.
7. The boundary of the Portishead East Wood Conservation Area runs through the rear gardens of the appeal site and the terrace of properties in which it sits, but as the flue is on the front elevation, views into or out of the Conservation Area are not, to my mind, harmed.
8. Overall, I conclude that the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace of surrounding properties. It breaches policy CS12 of the North Somerset Core Strategy (adopted January 2017) and policy DM32 of the North Somerset Development Management Policies Sites and Policies Plan (Part 1) (adopted July 2016).

Conclusion

9. Having taken into account all relevant representations made, for the reasons above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR