



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 3 August 2021

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/21/3273739

1 Treefield Place, St. Werburghs, Bristol BS2 9UU

- 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 Jonathan Price against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/05967/H, dated 1 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and erection of a new studio to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a new studio to front elevation, at 1 Treefield Place, St. Werburghs, Bristol BS2 9UU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/05967/H, dated December 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TFP 03 – Block/Site Plan and TFP 02 – Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations.
 - 3) The material to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. The content of the revised Framework has been considered but in light of the facts in this case it does not alter my conclusion.
3. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice as this more concisely describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area with a retail shop and school opposite the site. The area is characterised by a row of similarly designed terraced properties fronting on to a public footpath. To the rear of the terrace are private gardens which have been developed over time providing outbuildings, sheds and garages that front on to Treefield Place creating a roughly uniformed building line. These outbuildings vary in design and materials.
6. A garage is currently located at the site of the proposed development, and this directly fronts onto Treefield Place. The proposed single storey studio will replace the garage and the submitted plans and appeal statement detail that the studio would be larger than the existing garage, however the increase is only by some 0.4 metres in width, 1 metre in depth and 0.3 metres in height.
7. Although slightly larger the new building would retain a rear access and garden area for the host dwelling. Its location, matching the building line of the existing garage, ensures that the proposed development does not project forward of this, thereby retaining the visual character of Treefield Place. Further, I consider that the single storey nature of the proposed development and its use of matching materials would ensure its visual subservience to the host dwelling and not would detract from the character and appearance.
8. I note the Council's concern regarding the location of the proposed development on a corner plot, however during my site visit I noted that an additional dwelling has recently been constructed adjoining No 1 Treefield Place and a close boarded fence erected along its boundary. This dwelling, along with its boundary treatments, reduces the views of the appeal site when travelling north east along the adjoining highway (James Street). The main view of the appeal site is when travelling south west along James Street, where currently the front elevation of the garage is visible. Nonetheless, as the proposed development would be viewed as a single storey outbuilding in the context of a residential development and other single storey outbuildings along Treefield Place I am satisfied that it would not appear out of character with the surrounding area.
9. For the reasons set out above I consider that the proposed development would not be overly prominent or harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy¹ (2011) (CS), Policies DM26, DM27, DM29 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies² (2014) or the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development contributes positively to an area's character and respects the character of host buildings and the broader street scene. The proposal also complies with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks good design sympathetic to local character.

¹ Bristol City Council Development Framework Core Strategy (June 2011)

² Bristol City Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies – Local Plan (June 2014)
Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 – A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (October 2005)

Conditions

10. In the interest of certainty and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area the conditions requested by the Council regarding time limit, adherence with plans and use of matching material are considered to be necessary.

Conclusion

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

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR