



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/19/3234619

37 Wellington Hill, Horfield, Bristol BS7 8SP

- 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 S Whitfield against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02113/F, dated 29 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as, "Two storey dwelling within the corner plot. Single storey rear extension to existing dwelling. The front garden to No.37 will be re modelled to provide a further off street parking space for the existing property (self build)".
-

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 effect of the two storey dwelling on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Weston Crescent with Wellington Hill. This northern side of Wellington Hill where the appeal site is located, and Weston Crescent, which is the context within which the new dwelling would be viewed, are characterised by similarly designed dwellings, comprising short terraces and semi-detached properties set back from the road behind modest front gardens. The properties at road junctions, have space between their side elevations and the highway resulting in a pleasant sense of openness.
5. The new dwelling would be located on part of the side garden to No 37 and would be attached to its side elevation. The design of the new dwelling would be similar to nearby development, incorporating bay windows and a hipped roof form. In this regard it would respect the local distinctiveness of the area. However, its position relative to Wellington Hill and proximity to Weston Crescent would be uncharacteristic of development in the area. The new

dwelling would result in a prominent, incongruous form of development in the street scene which would disrupt and detract significantly from the uniform rhythm of development along both roads and reduce the sense of openness at this road junction.

6. On my site visit I observed the development of a two storey addition to the side of No 52 Wellington Hill which the appellant submits is similar to the appeal proposal. However, whilst the proportions of this development are similar to the proposal before me, the context within which it is viewed is not directly comparable. Each planning application and appeal must be determined on its merits, and the presence of similarly designed development nearby does not justify harmful development.
7. In conclusion I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework: Core Strategy and Policies DM26, DM27, DM29 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies: Local Plan which collectively seek to ensure that the design of development is of a high quality which contributes positively towards local character and distinctiveness and respects, builds upon or restores the local pattern and grain of development.

Other Matters

8. It is acknowledged that the proposal would contribute to the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes, however the development of this small site would make a limited contribution to the supply of housing in the area and accordingly this limits the weight that I can give this matter. A number of other factors have also been cited in support of the proposal, including the sustainability credentials of the site; that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on residential amenity or transportation issues and that the proposal would incorporate policy compliant renewable energy measures. These factors are not in dispute and carry neutral weight in my consideration of the proposal.
9. The matters advanced in support of the proposal, for the reasons set out above do not either individually or collectively outweigh the significant harm identified and the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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