
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3256422

72 Bedminster Road, Bedminster, Bristol BS3 5NP

- 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 R Sayeed against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/05359/H, dated 29 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey front and rear extension with part two storey rear element and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice as it sufficiently describes the proposal and the one given on the application form is unclear in part.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that extensions at the property had already been erected. However, elements, including the location of windows, were different to that shown on the plans referenced on the decision notice. I have therefore dealt with the appeal as a proposed development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The proposed dormer would extend across much of the main roof of the original dwelling and the side extension. As a result, it would dominate the roofscape of the property. The stepped roofline of the dormer and uncharacteristic use of render at roof level would result in a top heavy and disjointed appearance to the property. This would be at odds with the more simplistic roofscape of dwellings nearby where I did not see any dormers of a similar size and design to that proposed.
6. Therefore, the dormer would be incongruous with the surrounding area. It would be highly prominent from public views and from nearby properties given its scale and the corner location of the property.

7. The Council have not raised concerns over the other aspects of the development, and I note that planning permission has previously been granted for some elements of the scheme. Given the size of the plot and greater variation in the built form at ground and first floor level in nearby streets, I have reached the same finding.
8. My attention has been drawn to examples of dormers in the wider area. I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to those schemes being permitted. Nevertheless, they are some distance from the appeal site and would not be seen in the same context or views as the appeal property. Therefore, they are not directly comparable to the scheme before me.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, and the SPD¹. These, in part, require developments to respect the scale, form, proportions and materials of an area's character and that roof extensions sit comfortably within the plane of the host building's roof and appear subservient.

Other Matters

10. The appellant suggests that the proposed dormer could be constructed under permitted development rights. Nonetheless, there is no certificate of lawful development for this. Moreover, while calculations have been provided, the associated diagram does not reflect the design of the proposed stepped roof dormer and the elevation plans do not have dimensions annotated.
11. Therefore, I cannot be certain that the proposed dormer would be permitted development and I give this matter limited weight. This does not prejudice any future application for a lawful development certificate or enforcement proceedings.
12. I appreciate that the proposal would provide additional living accommodation at the property. Nonetheless, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

13. Therefore, for the reason given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 2 A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions