



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3229593

4 Bellamy Close, St George, Bristol, BS15 3AZ

- 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 Kevin Davis against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/06530/H, dated 12 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as upgrading of existing bungalow loft conversion consisting of removal of existing rear dormer, extending roof and forming a truncated hip on the gable and providing two pitched roof dormers on the front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed roof alterations and front dormers upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. Bellamy Close is a quiet, small, cul-de-sac made up of semi-detached bungalows of similar scale and character. Each bungalow has off road parking and attached or detached garages. Some of the properties have been extended and several side dormer extensions are visible within the street scene. Front dormer windows are not a characteristic of the area.
5. The substantial scale and front siting of the proposed roof alterations and additions would result in an incongruous roof form which would be out of keeping with the host property and its attached neighbour. It would result in an over dominant roof development which would overwhelm and unbalance the existing character of this pair of semi-detached properties. The contribution that the host property would make to the character and appearance of the street scene would be significantly diminished as a result. Harm to the consistent character of the surrounding area would result

6. Although the roof alterations are likely to be permitted development, as set out in the certificate of lawfulness¹ granted by the Council, the front dormer windows are not. The granting of the certificate does not alter my findings.
7. Other examples of front dormers within the vicinity of the appeal property have been drawn to my attention. However, with the exception of No 9 Bellamy Close which has a side and rear dormer window, none of the examples quoted are in close proximity to the appeal site and the context of them is not directly comparable. In any event, each case is considered on its own merits. The presence of similar development elsewhere does not justify harmful development.
8. As such, it is concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. There would be conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan and the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 2 A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions. These policies and guidance collectively require development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness and be of a high quality urban design, which respects the overall design and character of the host building and the broader street scene. These policies are consistent with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development, amongst other matters to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR

¹ Application number 19/01326/CP