



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3256009

30 Greenbank Road, Southville, Bristol, BS3 1RJ

- 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 Daniel Thompson against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/01671/H dated 15 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is removal of current roof and addition of one extra level of accommodation comprising of two-bedrooms and one en-suite bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Number 32 Greenbank Road (No. 32) is a traditional and modest part two-storey/part three-storey mid-terrace house within a residential area. It has a butterfly roof set behind a front parapet wall which is the same for all the properties within the terrace. The overall appearance of the terrace is uniform due to the identical, uncluttered front elevations with clear building lines and front parapet walls which step down slightly from each other to accommodate the sloping character of the road. The rear elevation of the terrace, where the butterfly roofs create a uniform and rhythmic pattern of development against the skyline, is clearly visible from Lower Sidney Street between the wide gaps separating properties.
4. The surrounding area is characterised by a range of residential properties of different styles and ages including blocks of flats of varying heights, more recently built terraces fronting Greenway Bush Lane as well as traditional terraces similar to the one which the appeal property forms part of. Within this context, the terrace with its simple, uniform and unspoilt appearance, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
5. The proposed development would extend the property at roof level to create an additional floor of accommodation in the style of a mansard roof. The front roof slope of the proposed extension would be set back behind the parapet wall and side walls would be sloped and tapered to reduce the bulk of the extension.

Despite the set-back, the proposed extension would nevertheless be visible behind the parapet wall from Greenbank Road. Moreover, whilst the sloping front and side elevations would reduce the bulk of the extension, it would be a prominent addition to the appeal property extending higher than neighbouring properties as well as being the only property within the terrace having been extended in this way. Consequently, it would interrupt the uniform and rhythmic appearance of the terrace, appearing as a discordant and dominant feature within the terrace.

6. A similar harmful effect would arise to the rear. Even though the proposed extension would be set back from the main rear elevation with the shape of the butterfly roof retained, the additional height and square form of the extension would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition in the context of the rest of the terrace. It would be clearly visible from Lower Sidney Street and would detract from the strongly defined rhythm of the butterfly roof slopes. This would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and its contribution to the wider area.
7. My attention has been drawn to similar roof extensions for which planning permission has been granted by the Council. This includes an extension at 89 Greenway Bush Lane (No. 89)¹, an end of terrace property close to the appeal site which has been extended in a way similar to the proposal before me. Having had the benefit of seeing this nearby development, I am not persuaded that such a development would not harm the character and appearance of either the appeal property, the terrace or the street scene along Greenbank Road. Furthermore, unlike No 89, the appeal proposal would be visible from public viewpoints to the rear which I have also found to be harmful.
8. I have also been referred to planning permissions for roof extensions to Numbers 15, 23 and 35 Hebron Road (Nos. 15, 23 and 35)² some distance from the appeal site and within a conservation area unlike the appeal site. The narrowness of Hebron Road severely restricts views of the roofscape, particularly to Nos. 15 and 23 which are mid terrace, unlike along Greenbank Road which is more open and wider. No. 35 occupies a corner position and whilst the extension would be visible, within the context of the varied roofscape along British Road to which it has a long frontage, it would not dominate in the same way the appeal scheme does. For these reasons, I do not find these developments, despite their similarities, justify the scheme before me.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014. These policies together seek development that is a high quality urban design which contributes positively to the character of the area and street scene; and reinforces local distinctiveness by responding appropriately to the shape and form of the existing buildings and roofscapes.

¹ Council Ref 18/02234/H

² Council Refs 19/05423/H, 17/01269/H and 20/00740/H

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised including the lack of objections from neighbours, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR