



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by K Jones BA (Hons) DipLA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/23/3321808

37 Hollywood Road, Brislington, Bristol City, Bristol BS4 4LD

- 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 Robert Hawkins against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01595/F, dated 4 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of attached garage and erection of one bed two person attached dwelling, with associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site part of the residential curtilage of 37 Hollywood Road. It is situated at the end of a short terrace of similar properties, forming a corner junction of Hollywood Road, Trelawney Park and Pendennis Park. This residential neighbourhood comprises a tight network of traditional terraced properties and occasional semi-detached dwellings.
4. Each terrace or group of properties in this area has a slightly different character, resulting from varied materials, front garden depth, architectural features such as bays and porches, and other ornamental detailing. Nevertheless, there is a striking regularity to the street scene created by the stepped rooflines following the gently sloping topography, and the pattern of repeated window and door openings.
5. The terrace adjoining the appeal site currently makes a positive and consistent contribution to this character, with attractively detailed stone front facades under tiled roofs. The appellant's design statement articulates the rationale for the proposed design in relation to the brick and render properties on adjacent Pendennis Road. However, on the end of a uniformly stone-fronted terrace, the use of predominantly brick elevations on the new dwelling would be incongruous in this context.
6. The appellant has described how it appears that a matching stone could be sought and used in place of brick, however I have been provided with no plans showing this detail, nor is there any certainty over the source or appearance of this stone. Moreover, while I accept that material details could be secured by condition, given the lack of clarity over the use of stone, it would not be

possible to word a condition with sufficient precision to ensure that a satisfactory appearance could be delivered.

7. While the proposal has sought to reference a number of design principles of adjoining properties, the differing proportions of the building adjacent to the remainder of the terrace would be starkly apparent. In particular, its width and considerably lower ridgeline would be at odds with the clearly defined form and regular appearance of the terrace. In combination with the contrasting material, the proposal would therefore be a prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene.
8. I acknowledge that the appeal site currently has a relatively run-down feel and makes a limited contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Nevertheless, comprising a low-level ancillary structure within a clearly defined private garden, the site does not significantly detract from the area. Having regard to the issues of proportion and materiality, the proposed development would not improve the character or appearance of the appeal site.
9. I note that there is an extension at the opposite end of the terrace which does not reflect the appearance of the terrace. However, much like the existing garage on the appeal site, the extension adjacent to No 31 is single storey and appears to be an ancillary extension without the same prominence as the proposal. My attention has also been drawn to a recent development on land to the rear of 32 Hollywood Road, which has a form and materiality which does not reflect its context. Unlike the appeal site, this is a detached property without a such a clearly defined built context. I therefore afford these developments only limited weight.
10. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework: Core Strategy (the Core Strategy), and Policies DM21, DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the Bristol Local Plan: Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (SADMP). Taken together, these policies require, amongst other matters, development that reinforces local distinctiveness, reflects locally characteristic architectural styles, and responds appropriately to the form and proportion of existing buildings.

Other Matters and Planning Balance

11. Both parties agree that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, and so paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged. In these circumstances, this sets out that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.
12. The proposal would accord with various policies of the development plan, including on matters relating to privacy and outlook, and with suitable controls in place would provide for appropriate cycle parking and waste management waste management. However, a lack of harm in these respects is neutral and weighs neither for nor against the development.
13. In the context of the Government objective to significantly boost the supply of homes, a single dwelling would make a small contribution towards the

provision of housing in the area. Taking into account the current use of the site, its location and the housing mix of the area, there would also be economic and social benefits both during the build and in its subsequent occupation. Given the limited quantum of development, I find that the benefits of the proposed dwelling would be modest.

14. However, the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development, in an area with a consistent and attractive character. The adverse impacts of the development would therefore significantly and demonstrably outweigh the modest benefits associated with a single dwelling, when considered against the Framework as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, that indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Jones

INSPECTOR