
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/19/3243493

145-147 East Street, Bedminster, Bristol BS3 4EJ

- 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 Matthew Price (Bankspace) against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04651/F, dated 24 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is originally described as a "roof extension with linking external enclosed unheated stair from the first floor".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension with linking external enclosed staircase from first floor at 145-147 East Street, Bedminster, Bristol BS3 4EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/04651/F, dated 24 September 2019, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The above description of development has been taken from the submitted application form. The proposal involves a roof extension to 147 East Street specifically and put more simply includes an enclosed external staircase linking from the first floor. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council incorrectly referenced one of the proposed plans of development on their decision notice. The appellant and Council have both verified that the plans submitted as part of this appeal are correct, complete and formed the basis for the Council's decision on the application. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, with particular regard for the Bedminster Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The appeal site forms part of the East Street Primary Shopping Area of the Bedminster

Town Centre and is located within the East Street Character Area of the Bedminster CA. This character area is described as having a strong urban townscape and industrial backdrop, with unlisted (and grouped) buildings of merit, and strong building lines and rhythm (due in part to the broadly consistent heights and roofscape of buildings) contributing to the significance of the wider CA. Locally listed Robinson Building is located to the rear of the appeal site and forms a key landmark feature that informs the CA¹.

6. The appeal site relates specifically to 147 East Street which is currently used, in conjunction with adjoining building 145 East Street, as a shared office space for individuals and businesses to rent on a monthly basis. No 147 is adjoined by unlisted buildings of merit on either side, including No 145, but is itself identified as a neutral building within the character appraisal for the CA. I observed this differentiation during my site visit and noted that the appeal site was the only building to have a flat roof design along this section of East Street, whilst the other adjoining buildings along this row had varied pitched roof designs, styles, heights and materials contributing to the character of the area.
7. With this context in mind, the appeal proposal would take positive steps towards sensitively unifying the roofscape of the appeal site with those currently present on adjoining buildings. The siting of the proposed roof extension back from the principle elevation of No 147 would reduce its visual prominence throughout the street scene by pushing its predominant bulk to the rear of the building. This combined with the elongated mansard roof design would also serve to align the curves of the proposed roof with the shared parapet wall with No 145 and the roofscape of the adjoining building at Nos 149-151. This positioning and design would subsequently serve to reduce the prominence of the proposed roof extension from angled views at either end of East Street, including the junction with Dean Street.
8. The Council expressed specific concerns over the proposed mansard roof design and the use of a standing seam finish as having a harmful effect on both the host building and surrounding area. However, neither of these features are foreign to the surrounding area with both the Robinson Building and nearby post office building having the same roofscape design and treatment. As such, this roofscape combination would not appear disruptive to the overall character and appearance of the host building, or incongruous with the predominant character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. The Council also raised concerns over the effect of the proposed roof extension on the setting of the locally listed Robinson Building, which constitutes a non-designated heritage asset². However, I do not consider the appeal proposal to represent a prominent feature which would draw attention away from the Robinson Building nor obstruct predominant views of this landmark from key vantage points along East Street, including the junction with Dean Street. As such, I am satisfied that proposed roof extension would have a neutral effect on the setting of Robinson Building as a non-designated heritage asset in this regard.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would effectively preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, including the

¹ Bedminster Conservation Area Character Appraisal (adopted December 2013)

² Paragraph 040 of the Planning Practice Guidance

Bedminster CA. It would not conflict with Policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted June 2011), Policies DM26, DM27, DM30 and DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (adopted July 2014), and Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Collectively these policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure development is designed to contribute positively towards local character and distinctiveness whilst conserving and enhancing heritage assets and their setting. The Framework provisions similarly support the conservation of heritage assets as appropriate to their significance.

Conditions

11. In allowing the appeal development I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, of which the appellant has had the opportunity to comment on. Where necessary I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions in the interests of precision and clarity, and in order to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the Framework.
12. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition for implementation. In addition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans in the interest of certainty. Conditions requiring details of the external building materials and boundary treatments to be submitted to the Council for approval are considered necessary given the sensitive location of the development within a CA. Conditions relating to the provision of onsite refuse storage and cycle parking are also considered necessary to ensure these facilities are available before the building is occupied or use commenced, and to maintain the character, appearance and function of the East Street Primary Shopping Area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan (Dwg No 000-010, Rev P01, dated 19/03/18); Existing Plans (Dwg No 100-010, Rev P01, dated 19/02/27); Existing Elevations (Dwg No 100-040, Rev P01, dated 19/02/27); Existing Elevations (Dwg No 100-041, Rev P01, dated 19/02/27); Proposed Plans (Dwg No 200-010, Rev P02, dated 19/02/27); Proposed Roof Plan (Dwg No 200-011, Rev P02, dated 19/02/27); Section AA (Dwg No 200-020, Rev P02, dated 19/02/27); Proposed Section BB (Dwg No 200-021, Rev P02, dated 19/02/27); Proposed Elevations (Dwg No 200-040, Rev P02, dated 19/02/27); Proposed Elevations (Dwg No 200-041, Rev P02, dated 19/02/27); 3D Street Views (Dwg No 500-001, Rev P01, dated 19/02/27); 3D Aerial Views (Dwg No 500-002, Rev P02, dated 19/02/27).
- 3) Samples of the external wall and roof of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant parts of those works are commenced. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples before the building is occupied.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or the use commenced until the refuse store and area/facilities allocated for storing of recyclable materials, have been completed in accordance with and as shown on the approved plans. Thereafter, all refuse and recyclable materials associated with the development shall either be stored within this dedicated store/area or internally within the building(s) that form part of the application site. No refuse or recycling material shall be stored or placed for collection on the adopted highway (including the footway), except on the day of collection.
- 5) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or the use commenced until the cycle parking provision shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only.

End of Schedule