
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021 by A J Sutton BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3272801

48 Redland Court Road, Redland, Bristol, BS6 7EH

- 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 Chris Leeks against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/05010/H, dated 21 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Application to raise the height of our roof slopes by a maximum of 85mm, to install a 'warm roof'. To achieve this the works we propose to undertake comprise: * Scaffold the whole house. * Remove all the existing tiles (which will be reused). * Remove and dispose of the tile battens. * Remove and dispose of the non-breathable bitumen roofing felt. * Fully cover the roof with horizontal runs of a breathable membrane, tucked down between each rafter to allow for the insulation between the rafters. * Install 100mm thick wood fibre insulation (chosen as it is sustainably sourced and breathable), between all rafters (rafter depth is 100mm). * Install 60mm of wood fibre insulation panels on top of the rafters (adding 60mm to final roof height). * Installation of 25mm vertical battens (this is so that water doesn't get trapped on top of the horizontal battens should any get in behind the tiles), (adding 25mm to the final roof height). * Installation of 25mm horizontal tile battens (like for like replacement of the original tile battens so not increasing the final roof height). * Install breathable tile felt. * Reinstall tiles.'
-

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 is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and the Cotham and Redland Conservation Area.

Reasons for Recommendations

4. The appeal property is one of paired dwellings on level ground near the descent of Redland Court Road. It is in the Cotham and Redland Conservation Area (CA) which is principally residential and characterised by a high-quality Victorian townscape with areas of historic green space. However, the dwelling is part of East Redland which was developed in a later period dating to the early 20th Century. With the exception of Nos 46 and 48 and neighbouring

paired dwellings, the properties of this period in the immediate area are detached, with more semi-detached dwellings on the lower part of the hill. Despite the variation this group is unified by consistency in materials, and the hipped roofs and hipped front projections with simple front planes. Collectively this creates an attractive roofscape which is highly visible at the descent of the hill. This is a distinct and positive characteristic of the street scene.

5. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires when determining proposals in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. At paragraph 192, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 193 states that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The appeal property is set close to the junction with Redland Green Road which is characterised by large Victorian dwellings. It is somewhat screened from the wider street scene by an apex of mature vegetation at this junction. It is located at a point of transition with modern infill development to the north and the distinct modern form of the Redland Green School which is in vast mature grounds.
7. The principal front roof plane of No 48 and its paired dwelling appears symmetrical and relatively unaltered with the exception of the small dormer additions. The original design appears to have no central line separating the dwellings at roof level. At ridge height there is a shared central chimney stack. The slight height difference between the properties is not readily discernible from the public realm for this reason.
8. In raising the existing roof plane, the proposal would create an incongruous vertical step between the dwellings. This change would be accentuated by the proposed vertical bonding gutter which would bisect and disrupt the existing simple roof plane. The base of the chimney stack at No 48 would also be altered and would no longer match that of No 46, emphasising the difference between the properties at roof level. As such the development would result in a distinct vertical break between the dwellings and would noticeably erode the existing symmetry at this aspect of the properties. These alterations would not respect the details and original design and character of the host building, its paired dwelling or the broader street scene to the east of Redland Court Road.
9. The harmful effect of the vertical division would be reduced by the birch tree to the front of the dwellings and views of the disruptive feature would be limited and localised on the street scene. The re-use of existing tiles would also minimise the identified harm. However, the unsympathetic roof alteration would have a negative impact on the appearance of the area where consistency in roof details makes a positive contribution to the significance of this part of the CA. It would, in this respect fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA, in conflict with the statutory test.
10. The harmful development would only affect a small part of the CA, and the harm to the significance of the CA as a whole would be less than substantial. In

accordance with the Framework this harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

11. The energy efficiency gains from the development would be consistent with policies of the Framework which seek a low carbon future. Policies BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) reflect this commitment and collectively require development should contribute to both mitigation and adaption to climate change through measures which include high standard of energy efficiency. Policy DM31 of the Sites Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (LP) also provides support for the installation of energy efficiency measures in conservation areas, provided that the works are the minimum required to achieve the energy efficiency improvements and do not conflict with the general principles of the policy, prioritising low-impact measures over invasive measures.
12. I have no doubt regarding the appellant's commitment to securing this benefit. However, in reviewing the evidence I am not persuaded that this is the only solution which would secure this beneficial gain whilst avoiding condensation within the property and managing access for the works. Whilst noting the greater level of internal disruption, some improvements in this respect could be secured which would be less invasive externally and that would not harmfully alter the appearance of the house. I therefore attach moderate weight to this benefit in this appeal.
13. Against this moderate public benefit is the great weight that I must attach to the harm that would be caused to the significance of the heritage asset's conservation. Consequently, the public benefits do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to this designated heritage asset.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the property and the Cotham and Redland Conservation Area. It would be contrary to policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the CS and policies DM26, DM30 and DM31 of the LP, which, collectively require that new development should deliver high quality urban design and will safeguard heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance. There would also be conflict with the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment objectives of the Framework and the guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document 2 A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions, which advises alterations to properties should be in character with the style of your house and the neighbourhood in general.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. There are no material considerations, including the Framework and the benefits of the proposal, that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR