
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/17/3179890

80 Radnor Road, Bishopston, Bristol BS7 8QZ

- 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 Le Moine against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/02712/H, dated 16 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front porch extension and roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey front porch extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the roof extension.
2. Planning permission is granted for a roof extension at 80 Radnor Road, Bishopston, Bristol BS7 8QZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/02712/H, dated 16 May 2017, so far as relevant to that part of the works hereby permitted and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby granted permission shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:-
 - a. Site location plan 17023 AP01;
 - b. Existing plans and elevations 17023 AP02; and
 - c. Proposed plans and elevations 17023 AP03 Rev B.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey front porch and roof extension on the character and appearance of 80 Radnor Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 80 Radnor Road is a mid-terraced house within a residential area comprising mostly houses of similar ages and styles. Positioned upon a hillside No 80 is part of a long terrace of houses that gently step down the hill. A defining characteristic of these houses and those nearby is their repeated similarity of size, style and form.
5. The proposed roof extension would raise the eaves and ridge height of the roof of No 80. As these would continue the line of the eaves and ridge of 82 Radnor Road and the roof would have a similar pitch, this extension would not harm the character or appearance of No 80 or the harmony and cohesion of the terrace.
6. However, the projection of the proposed front porch extension beyond the existing bay window would unacceptably erode the repeated similarity of the houses within the terraced row. Despite the variety of alterations and extensions to nearby houses, the bay windows remain a repeated feature of the estate. The simplicity of the form of the houses and the presence of the bays gives a rhythmical uniformity to the long terraces. This is a distinctive aspect of the character and appearance of the area that the front extension would disrupt.
7. Furthermore, the size and extent of the projection of the porch beyond the bay would interrupt the building line of the terrace, making the porch unacceptably prominent. As well as making No 80 distinctly different from the surrounding houses, these differences would unacceptably erode the cohesion of the terrace.
8. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to other porch extensions within the area. I saw at my site visit that several houses had front porches that had extended the bay. Nevertheless, as these extensions continue the line of the front face and depth of the bays they have a subservience that does not detract from the dominance of these windows and their contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
9. I accept that some houses in the estate have porch extensions that project beyond the bays. However, there are very few of these and as such the repeated harmony of the style and form of the houses within the terraces remains dominant upon the front elevation. Moreover, I do not have the full planning history of these properties before me, and in any case each scheme has to be treated on its own individual merits in accordance with the requirements of the current development plan and all other material considerations, as I have undertaken in this instance.
10. Thus for the reasons given the proposed roof extension would not harm the character and appearance of 80 Radnor Road and the surrounding area, but the single storey front porch extension would cause unacceptable harm. The porch extension would therefore conflict with Policies BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM26, DM27, and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014), and the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005). These require amongst other things, high quality design that contributes positively to an area, reinforces local distinctiveness and respects the character

of the host building, thereby reflecting objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against paragraph 206 of the Framework. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision they have been altered to better reflect these requirements.
12. I have imposed the standard time condition and one requiring the permitted works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans so as to avoid doubt and in the interests of proper planning. To ensure that the external materials of the roof extension would harmonise with the host building and that of the other houses in the terrace, I have imposed a condition requiring details and samples.

Conclusion

13. The scheme involves different elements that are physically and functionally independent. In this respect I find the roof extension to be acceptable and clearly severable from the single storey front porch extension. Therefore I propose to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the roof extension, but dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the single storey front porch extension.
14. Thus, for the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is part allowed and part dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR