



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/17/3175576

13 Christina Terrace, Bristol, BS8 4QB

- 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 Crawshay-Jones against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00727/F, dated 9 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a new side elevation window at ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and whether the development would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the City Docks Conservation Area (CA), within which the property is situated.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an attractive end of terrace 3-storey Victorian property situated in a prominent position at the junction of Christina Terrace and Oldfield Road. Its front elevation is stone built with decorative bays, but its return frontage onto Oldfield Road is brick built with regularly placed window openings and distinctive stringcourses. I note that a house of a similar design and materials backs onto the appeal property at the junction of Sandford Road and Oldfield Road, albeit that this is a storey less in height.
4. The appellant has recently completed what appears to be a replacement single-storey protrusion to the rear, and now proposes the insertion of a window at ground floor level on the Oldfield Road frontage, to be set in a brick panel adjoining the newly built extension.
5. The appellant says that:

The nub of the Council's concern is that the single new window proposed will seriously disrupt the rhythm of fenestration of the host building, such that it will lead to harm justifying a refusal of planning permission.

I strongly disagree with this suggestion and consider that this is an exaggerated concern given that just a single window is proposed, in a side elevation that already contains several existing windows. The form, materials and design composition of the window will closely match the

existing windows in the side elevation. The proposed window is at ground floor level and will simply continue the horizontal line of windows at this level. The overall visual impact will not be unduly visually obtrusive in any way. Accordingly, neither the character and appearance of the host building or the character and appearance of the City Docks Conservation will be harmed by this proposal.

6. Judgments on matters of this nature are essentially subjective in nature and I can therefore understand why disagreements may occur. However, I find the appeal property to have an attractive main side elevation of some scale whose composition has virtually been retained intact for well over a century, albeit that the original windows have been replaced.
7. I share the Council's view that the insertion of a new window opening in the manner proposed would harmfully disrupt the balanced rhythm of the established fenestration pattern and, taking account of the extension's fenestration, result in a visually displeasing surfeit of fenestration at ground floor level. Additionally, the new window proposed is without apparent justification since the room to be served by it is already served by another.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed insertion of a window would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, and policy DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, directed to promoting high quality urban design and that alterations to existing property should respect the siting, scale, form, proportions, details and the overall design and character of the host building and the broader street scene. I also conclude that neither the character nor appearance of the CA would be preserved or enhanced were this proposal to proceed. A conflict accordingly arises with the provisions of CS policy BCS22 directed to protect the City's heritage assets from inappropriate development.

Other matters

9. I note the references to other development plan policies, but those to which I have referred are considered the most relevant in this case. I have also noted the references to the *National Planning Policy Framework*.
10. All other matters referred to in the representations have been taken into consideration, including the references to the CA appraisal, but no other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR