



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/19/3236048

28 Stackpool Road, Southville, Bristol, BS3 1NQ

- 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 Steve Stevenson against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01066/H, dated 1 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is 'loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the appearance and character of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site is a two-storey, semi-detached house on a suburban residential street in the Stackpool Road zone of the Bedminster Conservation Area. The house is one of three matching semi-detached pairs in a row, all of which have retained the original hipped roof form and a clear sense of balance and symmetry. The Bedminster Area Character Appraisal (adopted December 2013) for Stackpool Road describes a 'quality and distinctiveness to individual streets given by architectural details and views across the city', a strong building line and consistency of scale. Predominant materials are brick, limestone and pennant sandstone. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019 (NPPF) states that great weight should be given to an asset's conservation, with any harm or loss requiring clear and convincing justification.
4. The proposed dormer would occupy nearly all of the roof slope and be raised up to the current ridge line. This would appear as a large and top-heavy extension, which in my opinion would not be subservient or sit comfortably within the plane of the current roof. The structure of the windows, as a series of vertical cast channels and light grey metal clad walling do not reflect the architectural detailing of the host building. Through its incongruous size, structure and materials the loft conversion would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host house and the development would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policies BCS22 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, adopted June 2011 (Core Strategy), DM30 and DM31 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies,

adopted July 2014 (Local Plan) and the recommendations of the Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 (October 2005), a material planning consideration to which I give significant weight. Together these require that extensions should respect the scale, form, proportions, materials, details and overall design and character of the host building, and safeguard elements which contribute to their special character.

5. The existing parapet provides a degree of screening from the public domain and the extension would not be visible immediately outside the house or easily seen from the east. I have taken into account that the development would be set back from the front parapet, further reducing its visibility. However, the structure would be clearly visible near the junction with Edgware Road, some 100m uphill, from which it would appear incongruous and discordant. I have also taken into account the slight change in rhythm to the area's distinctive saw-tooth roofline caused by the parapets on this row but consider that the development would be sufficiently visible that it would be harmfully intrusive on the existing skyline and exacerbated by the incongruent metal cladding, which is not characteristic of the area. The proposals are therefore in conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy and Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Local Plan, because they would not respond appropriately to the form and proportion of existing building lines, skylines and roofscape or reflect local materials, colours and the textures of the broader street scene.
6. Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that developments affecting heritage assets should make a positive contribution to the local character and for the reasons above this proposal is incompatible with this policy. Where less than substantial harm to a heritage asset is identified, Paragraph 196 of the NPPF requires that any harm is weighed against the public benefits, which in this case are negligible and therefore do not justify the harm identified.
7. I note that the neighbouring property has recently had a similar extension, and that several other examples of roof conversions and dormer windows can be observed nearby. The existence of other roof extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified.

Conclusions

8. For reasons of harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Davies

Inspector