

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

**by C Cresswell BSc (Hons) MA MBA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 03 July 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/17/3176665**

**8 Clifton Park Road, Clifton, Bristol BS8 3HL**

- 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 Mike Davies against the decision of Bristol City Council.
  - The application, Ref 17/00904/H dated 17 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as "removal of rear elevation balcony, construction of small conservatory".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The name of the appellant in the heading above is taken from the Appeal Form rather than the original Application Form.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated within a row of historic terraced houses which face Clifton Park Road. It is part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area, the significance of which lies mainly in the architectural quality of the historic buildings in the area. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) states that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. Properties in the terrace are traditionally proportioned and of similar design, providing a clear architectural rhythm along the frontage of Clifton Park Road. The rear of the terrace also displays a good degree of consistency, even though individual dwellings have been subject to various alterations over the years. One aspect of this is the pattern of fenestration visible above ground floor level. Although door and window styles vary, most feature panelled glazing and maintain a simple appearance, in keeping with the traditional characteristics of the terrace.

6. It is proposed to construct a conservatory on the first floor of the appeal property. This would be supported by metal posts and would project outwards from the rear elevation, effectively creating an enclosed space in place of the existing balcony. While the conservatory would be relatively modest in size, it would nonetheless be taller and wider than the existing glazed doors. As there are no similar first floor conservatories elsewhere on the rear elevation of the terrace, this would have the effect of making the appeal property appear somewhat inconsistent with its neighbours. Despite the modifications made to the original proposal, the conservatory would also increase the visual complexity of the rear elevation, distracting from the relatively simple pattern of fenestration which defines this part of the terrace.
7. The appellant argues that the rear of the terrace does not have a particularly consistent appearance. However, whilst properties vary at ground floor level (with some having extensions) the terrace retains a reasonably traditional and simple appearance from the first floor level upwards. During the course of my site visit I saw the three storey extension to the rear of No 4 and am informed that all of the properties in the terrace are likely to have had similar extensions at some point in the past. Yet while the extension to No 4 is considerably larger than the proposed conservatory, it is consistent with the traditional appearance of the terrace both in terms of its proportions and its simple pattern of fenestration. In contrast, the proposed conservatory would be seen as an ad-hoc addition to the rear elevation which would not reflect the style of architecture present elsewhere within the terrace. The proposal would therefore have a visually harmful impact even though it would not involve the demolition or removal of any historic elements of the property.
8. Although the conservatory would not be seen from the public domain, the significance of the Conservation Area is also derived from how it is experienced from within the private domain. In this regard, I note that the rear elevation of the appeal property can be seen from a number of surrounding properties. Whilst I accept that the conservatory would be relatively small in the context of the wider terrace, it would nonetheless represent an incremental change which would erode the traditional appearance of the rear elevation. I am also mindful that allowing this appeal would make it more difficult for the Council to resist similar proposals for development and the cumulative effect would add further to the harm that I have identified above. In reaching this decision, I have borne in mind the 'great weight' which the Framework attaches to the protection of Conservation Areas.
9. However, the harm I have identified would be less than substantial and in such circumstances the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against any public benefits associated with the development. In this particular case I fully appreciate the appellant's wish to improve their property and recognise that the conservatory would create more desirable living conditions. Nonetheless, as these benefits of this would be private in nature the harm to the heritage asset would not be outweighed.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area. It would conflict with Policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 which seek to maintain the distinctive characteristics of areas and preserve heritage assets. There would also be conflict with Policies DM26,

DM30 and DM31 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 which have similar objectives.

**Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*C Cresswell*

INSPECTOR