



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2019

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3223952

30 Clark Street, Easton, Bristol BS5 0TA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Paradise against Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/05539/H, dated 17 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is a roof conversion to create mansard roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a dwelling within a terrace which runs the length of Clark Street. All dwellings have parapets which hide the roofs as seen from the street. Although there is some slight variation in finish to the frontages, the street on both sides has a strong uniform character and appearance with a continual run of properties along the length of the street.
4. The proposed development would introduce a stark and dominant feature to number 30 which would be clearly visible from the street. This would interrupt the uniform appearance of the terrace as well as the overall character of the street. Whilst I acknowledge that the traditional materials and slight incline away from the frontage and parapet would help to mitigate for the visibility of the development, the appellant's plans and street scene sketches demonstrate to me that the roof extension would be visible. I consider that this visibility would represent a visual intrusion into the otherwise uniform street.
5. Due to the regular pattern of development at Clark Street and the dominant form and prominent nature of the proposed mansard roof, I consider it would interrupt the uniform character and appearance of the street as a whole.
6. I acknowledge the subsequently permitted extension¹ at the site which allowed a roof extension. However, although the comparisons provided demonstrate that the approved extension has addressed the Council's concerns, by reducing the height at the front and altering the angle so that views of the extension are

¹ 18/06697/H

significantly limited or removed, I am not satisfied that the proposal before me is acceptable for the reasons already stated.

7. The development proposed would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host property. It would be contrary to the objectives of policy BCS21 of the Bristol City Council Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol City Council Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 which, amongst other things, seek to control development and promote high quality and inclusive design that reflects and responds positively to the particular local distinctiveness of the site and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has directed me to other nearby mansard roof extensions, however I consider that these are set in different contexts. At Armoury Square, I was able to see a variety of different roof types and the uniformity which is distinct in Clark Street is not so apparent here. This location is also not a singular street in the same manner to Clark Street.
9. At Goodhind Street, whilst there are terraces of similar design to those at Clark Street, the overall character and appearance of that street is different given the changing types and sizes of development and varying roof treatments, including modern buildings and a church. Added to this, there is a change in the positioning of front elevations which adds to the variance and reduces the uniformity here. Goodhind Street is also wider with other modern properties being set back from the road, thus creating in a difference character and appearance as a result of the added space between development.
10. The appellant has referred to the scheme at Goodhind Street² as setting a precedent. However, for the reasons described above I consider that the proposed development before me is subject to different circumstances and so the two are not directly comparable and this does not alter my decision.
11. I accept that through the proposed development the whole building would undergo restoration and enhancement, and whilst these would be a benefit in this respect, they are not sufficient to overcome the harm I have identified. Notwithstanding the local support for the proposed development, this does not outweigh the harm.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as whole, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR

² 09/03252/H