

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

**by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 9 September 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/20/3252543**

**48 Gatehouse Avenue, Hartcliffe, Bristol BS13 9AD**

- 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 Paul Clark against the decision of Bristol City Council.
  - The application Ref 19/05912/F, dated 6 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as the "Construction of a second storey over an existing single storey side extension to an end of terrace property, to enable the new property to be converted to a separate dwellinghouse from the original".
- 

## 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 site lies at the junction of Gatehouse Avenue and Elvard Road; it comprises an end of terrace dwelling with an attached, single storey annexe. The end elevation of the annexe is set back in the site from the footway along Elvard Road. The area is characterised by both terraces of dwellings and semi-detached properties, set back from the road at their frontage, creating an appreciable and well-defined urban grain. Properties were also generally set back from road junctions, which allowed for a feeling of spaciousness within the street, as well as resulting in noticeable building lines in views along the roads in the area.
4. The appeal scheme proposes the erection of an additional storey above the existing single-storey annexe, in order to create a separate dwelling. Whilst I appreciate that the existing footprint of the annexe would be utilised, the addition of a first floor above would introduce a substantial amount of massing atop the existing structure. The existing annexe is relatively unobtrusive given its single storey height and shallow pitched roof; however, the added development would result in the structure appearing as an overly dominant feature in the street, particularly as viewed when travelling along Elvard Road to Gatehouse Avenue. It would appear as an assertive and intrusive feature, substantially protruding in front of the building lines of dwellings along Elvard Road. Moreover, it would reduce the openness of the corner at this location, diminishing the spaciousness of the street.

5. The presence of an access lane to the rear of the property providing some separation between the proposal and the dwellings along Elvard Road would do little to ameliorate the effect of the proposal that I identify above. I have also had regard to the examples cited by the appellant, but find that these are different in context than the appeal site, most notably due to the position of the building line to the rear of one of the sites and due to the presence of a grassed area to the side of another. The circumstances of the case before me are materially different and as such neither of these schemes are comparable.
6. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with policies BCS20 and BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework – Core Strategy (2011), as well as policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is informed by local context, reinforces local distinctiveness and respects the local pattern and grain of development, as well as that the layout of development establishes coherent building lines and that alterations to existing buildings respect the form of the broader street scene.

### **Conclusion**

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

*Martin Allen*

INSPECTOR