



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/19/3242361

15 Culverwell Road, Bishopsworth, Bristol BS13 9EY

- 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 Ms R Bowman against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02980/F, dated 19 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the subdivision of land and erection of a 2-bedroom dwelling in the curtilage of 15 Culverwell Road, associated parking and amenity area.
-

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 dwelling on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property is sited on the corner of Culverwell Road and Whiting Road. Both are pleasant, suburban residential roads, mostly characterised by terraced or semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind gardens and parking areas, with a consistent building line and largely open corner plots such as the appeal site, contributing to the area's open, spacious character.
5. The development of the side garden of the host property as proposed would significantly erode the open appearance of the appeal site by extending up to Whiting Road forward of the established building line and, given the scale of the proposed dwelling, would appear as a prominent, incongruous addition in the street scene.
6. The dwelling opposite the appeal site at No 13 Culverwell Road has an extension which sits proud of the building line on the opposite side of Whiting Road, however given its single storey nature its visual impact is not comparable to the proposed two storey dwelling.

7. The appellant points to numerous examples of similar developments in the vicinity in support of the proposal. Firstly, with regards to No 5 Kilmersdon Road¹ there appears to be a substantial side garden remaining, which retains the sense of openness at the junction. The approvals and developments at No 27 Culverwell Road², No 11 Kilmersdon Road³ and Nos 85⁴ and 87 Fair Furlong⁵ clearly detract from the street scene, and I consider that such unsatisfactory developments do not provide justification for further harm to the street scene. In addition, each application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits, and this is the approach that I have taken in my consideration of this case.
8. I acknowledge that the proposal would make a contribution to the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes and that the location of the appeal site is close to numerous facilities. I attach moderate weight to these matters. I also acknowledge that the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions to the occupiers and nearby occupiers and that the building would be constructed to reduce carbon emissions. However, these matters carry neutral weight because they would be expected of any well-designed development.
9. Against these benefits is the substantial harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area. I find therefore that the benefits of the scheme do not individually, or cumulatively, outweigh the harmful impact identified.
10. In light of the foregoing I conclude that the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies DM21, DM26 and DM27 of the Bristol Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014, which set out that development should be appropriate to the immediate context, be of a high quality, and specifically that development of garden land should not result in harm to the character and appearance of an area.

Conclusion

11. 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

12. 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 Approval ref: 07/05766/F

² Approval ref: 01/3326/F

³ Approval ref: 16/02035/F & 16/05667/F

⁴ Approval ref: 17/02787/F

⁵ Approval ref: 15/02860/F