



Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 24 and 31 May 2022

by O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/22/3295521

45 Bridgwater Road, Bristol BS13 7AX

- 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 Chris Warren against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04481/H, dated 27 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a semi-detached pair of two storey dwellings. The proposed rear dormer would have a height below the ridge of the existing roof and would be positioned above the current eaves level. It would also have a total surface area less than the rear of the building and to this extent would be subservient to the rear elevation as a whole.
4. However, the dormer would be wide, extending across a large part of the original property's roof. Relative to the rear roof slope, its tall height and resultant mass means that there would be limited space on the roof around the dormer. As a result, it would have a dominating effect on the roof. Furthermore, when viewed in conjunction with the roof of the adjoining dwelling, 47 Bridgwater Road, which has no rear roof additions, the size of the proposed dormer would result in the pair appearing unbalanced.
5. The rear dormer would not be visible to the front, from Bridgwater Road. Public views to the rear would also be limited, and existing tall trees and hedging would screen the dormer in some views. However, the rear dormer would be visible from Poplar Road, as well as from neighbouring houses.
6. The dormer's design incorporates a flat roof. Whilst this limits its height, it gives the dormer a box-like appearance. This together with the dormer's size, means that it would not sit comfortably within the plane of the host building's roof. For these reasons, the dormer would fail to respect the proportions and form of the host dwelling, or those of the semi-detached pair.

7. The Council has not objected to the side dormer, and I see no reason to disagree. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the rear dormer would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies BCS21 of the Bristol Local Plan Core Strategy adopted 2011 and policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies adopted 2014. These require development to have an appropriate design, including in respect of roofscapes.
9. For similar reasons, it would also conflict with the advice in Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' 2005 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, that development should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. There may well be other examples of large facing dormer windows in Bristol and elsewhere, possibly undertaken without needing planning permission. However, no specific examples have been drawn to my attention and, in any case, I have considered the proposal on its own merits with regard to the character and appearance of this area.
11. Sketches have been provided showing a potential alternative 'wrap around' dormer to the side and rear of the property, which the appellant believes could at one time have been erected under Permitted Development Rights. This alternative would be larger and more intrusive to the host property and the street scene than the appeal proposal. However, it is common ground that planning permission would be required for this alternative scheme, and so it does not represent a potential fallback. This is, therefore, of very little weight.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, there would be conflict with the Development Plan read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

O Marigold

INSPECTOR