



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3231594

39 Duckmoor Road, Bristol BS3 2DQ

- 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 Geoff Armstrong against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/05548/H, dated 10 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is alteration and extension to existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies on a corner plot with the house fronting Duckmoor Road and the side boundary running along Irby Road. The garage subject of this appeal is at the end of the back garden, with its front section on the Irby Road boundary and a slightly taller element behind. The area is predominantly residential, characterised by 2 storey high houses with garages and outbuildings tending to be single storey and positioned inconspicuously.
4. The proposal would increase the depth, eaves and ridge height of the rear part of the garage so that the resulting building would be markedly taller and bulkier than the front element of the garage. Despite the presence of nearby houses and set back from the road, the proposed development would be apparent close to the appeal site on Irby Road and from Duckmoor Road when approaching from the south east.
5. By reason of its height, overall size and general appearance the proposal would appear as an unusually large outbuilding that would be incongruous to the pattern of development in the area. Whilst smaller than nearby houses, the excessive height of the proposed development compared to other outbuildings would be peculiar, at odds with and harmful to the character of the locality. The proposed materials and architectural detailing would not address or override the harm caused by reason of the proposal's discordant size and form.
6. The appeal site is not within a conservation area or any other area recognised for the quality of its environment. However, policies seeking to achieve high

quality design that reflects the character of a locality relate to all development proposals. I have been referred to another development elsewhere in Bristol, however I have no details of the background to this proposal and in any case have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits. Reference has been made to the benefits of the proposal to the occupants of the appeal property, but I find that these would fail to outweigh the identified harm.

7. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, and in this regard, it would be contrary to policy BCS21 of the adopted Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011, policies DM26, DM27, DM29 and DM30 of the adopted Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 and the Council's Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2005. These aim, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of high quality design and avoid harm to the character and appearance of an area.
8. As such, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR