



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2019

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/19/3224582

6 Braikenridge Road, Brislington, Bristol BS4 3SW

- 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 Parsons against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00625/H, dated 8 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as: 'retention of rear roof extension, side roof extension and works to roof above existing side extension (resubmission of refused application 18/04590/H)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear roof extension, side roof extension and works to roof above existing side extension at 6 Braikenridge Road, Brislington, Bristol BS4 3SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00625/H, dated 8 February 2019.

Procedural Matters

2. In allowing the appeal I have removed the reference to the retention of the alterations because this is not an act of development. I have also removed reference to the proposal being a resubmission of a previously refused application. Whilst this may have been helpful when the application was originally submitted, it is not relevant to the appeal. In making these changes, I am satisfied that the interests of the main parties have not been compromised.
3. The proposal is identical to two previously refused planning applications¹ which sought retrospective planning permission for roof alterations. An appeal was lodged against the most recent refusal² but this was after the deadline had passed for submitting a valid appeal. As a consequence, the Council agreed to determine a further identical submission to enable the right of appeal to be exercised.
4. In 2016, planning permission was given for a dormer window to the rear³, but this has not been constructed as originally proposed. In addition, a side dormer window has also been constructed without planning permission. It is these alterations for which the appeal seeks retrospective planning permission.

¹ 18/00999/H and 18/04590/H2

² APP/Z0116/D/19/3221500

³ 16/02958/H

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses which have a hipped roof and are faced in roughcast render with mock-timber detailing to a pair of full-height, centrally located bay windows. The site is one of a number of semi-detached houses that are comparable in terms of scale, appearance, and spacing between buildings. However, subtle variation exists in the roofscape, with pairs of houses alternating hipped and gable ended roofs. The rhythm of this alternating roof form combined with the consistent scale and appearance of the houses creates a harmonious and pleasing street scene.
7. The appeal site has previously been extended to the side at two storey level and the front facing wall of this extension is noticeably set back from the front of the house. However, as a result of the recent alterations, although the eaves height is marginally set back from the original eaves line, the roof above the extension is not. Instead it continues the same profile of the original roof and no longer incorporates a reduced ridge height. Despite the altered profile of the roof, the pronounced set back of the front elevation as well as the step in the eaves line ensures that the extension continues to be subservient to the host dwelling. Consequently, the original form of the pair of houses remains suitably distinguishable.
8. The side dormer window, which has a gable end and is clad in white uPVC shiplap cladding, also continues the ridge height of the original roof. However, the side cheeks of the dormer are set in from the side of the roof and the window is also set back from the side facing eaves line. Consequently, due to its size and location within the side facing roof slope, the form of the dormer window does not dominate the side elevation and the hipped roof of the extended dwelling remains readily appreciable. The dormer window as constructed is therefore demonstrably subservient to the overall form of the extended and altered roof.
9. The use of a white cladding material contrasts with the prevailing rooftiles of the surrounding roofscape. However, although the proposal introduces a different facing material at an elevated level, the house is faced in white render. Due to the dominance of this material at ground and first floor level, the cladding is not in stark contrast with the overall appearance of the building. Instead, the colour of the cladding is complementary to the facing materials and general composition of the house.
10. Therefore, for the reasons identified above, I am satisfied that the altered roof form and the side dormer window are suitably respectful to the original dwelling. Consequently, in its extended and altered form, the dwelling continues to complement the pleasing street scene identified above.
11. The Council are satisfied that the scale and form of the rear dormer window are acceptable and based on the evidence that I have before me, I have no reason to arrive at a different conclusion. Furthermore, due to the previously granted consent, matters in relation to overlooking would not be materially different with this proposal. Their concern, however, manifests itself in the white

cladding facing material. Although the cladding contrasts with the colour of the roof tiles, for the same reasons as identified above, the cladding material is complementary to the appearance of the existing dwelling.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it accords with Policy BSC21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014), and advice contained within the Supplementary Planning Document Number 2: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005). Taken together, these require amongst other things, extensions and alterations that contribute to an area's local character, respect the overall design and character of the host building and broader street scene, and are appropriate to the immediate context.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons identified above, the appeal is allowed. No conditions are necessary because the proposal is for retrospective planning permission.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR