



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/20/3256666

**Land at Junction of Church Road and Chalks Road, Redfield, Bristol
BS5 9HT**

- 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 Chaps Property Ltd against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01651/F, dated 7 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a four-storey building comprising a café bar (A4) at ground floor level and 9no. self-contained flats at first, second and third floor level.
-

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises of a prominent, currently vacant plot, located on the corner of Chalks Road and Church Road, in east Bristol near St Georges Park. Opposite the site is the pedestrian entrance to the park.
5. Church Road is a lengthy street, and to the west of the site the area is busy and commercial in character, comprising a mix of two and three storey development. Further to the east the area has a more mixed residential and commercial character. Chalk Road is more residential in character, with terraced dwellings near the site, which are mostly two storeys in height.
6. The new building would be substantially higher than neighbouring development in both Church Road and Chalks Road. It would be a tall, imposing building within the streetscene with a bulk and massing that would not reflect nearby development. The scale of the building, emphasised by the flat roofed design, would give the building a massing and visual prominence that would dominate the surroundings and would result in an incongruous development, out of keeping with the surrounding context. The use of materials to reflect the

appearance of the area and the set back of the upper storey of the building would not be sufficient to mitigate this harm.

7. In reaching this view I am mindful that there is a mix of architectural styles and forms in the locality, including modern architecture in Church Road in the guise of apartments above the ground floor shop fronts at Nos 176- 180 and at Clayewater Court on Blackswarth Road. However, these developments are more modest in height and significantly less prominent, given their mid terrace location. They are not comparable to the appeal proposal.
8. It is understood that an application¹ for the erection of 8 flats has been approved on the site and partly built out. It remains therefore extant. This development would be set over 2-3 storeys, would be low key in appearance and more in keeping with the immediate surrounding structures. In the event that this scheme was completed I consider that it would reflect the character and appearance of the area, which the appeal proposal would not. The presence of this planning permission does not provide justification for harmful development as proposed.
9. In light of the foregoing, it is concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, there is conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the Bristol Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 which collectively advocate that new development should deliver high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character and identity, be of a high quality and respect the scale, form, proportions and the overall design and character of the broader street scene. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires at paragraph 127 that developments, amongst other matters, are sympathetic to local character and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Conclusion

10. 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

11. 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 Reserved matters reference number 07/00677/M