



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2023

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/23/3320525

88 Stockwood Road, Stockwood, Bristol City, Bristol, BS14 8JE

- 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 & Mrs King against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03452/F, dated 11 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as "demolition of single storey side conservatory and construction of 2-storey, 2-bed dwelling together with associated works."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published, replacing the 2022 version. The policies of the Framework that are material to this case have not fundamentally changed. I have proceeded to determine the appeal having regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and sustainable energy sources.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential suburban area characterised by similarly designed semi-detached houses set back from the road with gardens/parking to the front. A number of the houses have been altered and extended over time. Corner plots are set back on both sides which combined with the set back of other houses creates an open character. The appeal site is a corner plot with Stockwood Road to its front and Selden Road. Houses along both Stockwood Road have a strong established building line. On Selden Road there is some variety to the building line, however this is minor and dwellings are largely set back from the highway in a consistent line.
5. The proposed development would introduce a two-storey extension, effectively extending to the boundary of the appeal site, into the side garden of the host dwelling. Due to its location on a corner it would bring built development closer to the adjoining pavement and highway. This would noticeably reduce the spacious feel to the area, upsetting its pleasant rhythm and balance. It would

accordingly result in a cramped appearance to the street scene and thus be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

6. This intrusion into an open space would be apparent from Selden Road. Whilst there is a small variety to the building line there is a set back of built form from the highway. The proposed development would be located much closer to the highway than other built form on this side of Selden Road and would diminish the open characteristic of the area. The proposal would be discordant with the character of the area in that it would introduce built form in front of the established building line. It would be visible from the surrounding roads and pavements and would be a prominent feature harming the areas character and appearance.
7. I consider that the proposal, whilst flush with the front elevation at ground floor, would appear subservient to the host dwelling due to its set down from the ridge, and set back and first floor from the front elevation. Additionally the use of matching materials would ensure the proposal would not appear at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. With the above in mind, the proposal would be contrary to Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (CS) Policy BCS21 and Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (LP) Policies DM21, DM26 and DM27, which seek, amongst other things, development that contributes positively to an area's character and identity and respects the pattern and grain of development. The appeal scheme would also be contrary to paragraph 135 of the Framework that seeks visually attractive development that are sympathetic to local character.

Energy and carbon reduction targets

9. CS Policy BCS14 requires that developments include measures to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from energy use. It is expected that developments provide sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from residual energy by at least 20%.
10. With the appeal the appellant has submitted a Climate Change and Sustainability Statement which details that an air source heat pump will be provided. No other methods of heating have been proposed. I note that the Council have had the opportunity to review the submission and consider that this would overcome their reason for refusal relating to this issue.
11. Accordingly, the proposed development would make adequate provision to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from energy use. I find no conflict with CS Policy BCS14 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that developments include measures to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The proposal would also comply with paragraph 159 of the Framework which seeks to ensure that developments reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Other Matters

12. The appellant states that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. If I were to accept the appellant's position then paragraph 11 d of the Framework would apply and the most important policies for determining the appeal would be deemed to be out of date. As the erection of a single dwelling, the proposal would make a very limited contribution to any housing

undersupply. The scale of the scheme would accordingly limit its associated socio-economic benefits.

13. Paragraph 135 of the Framework requires that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. I have found that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm on the on the character of the area in the manner I have described above. I ascribe significant weight to this harm which would be long lasting. Therefore, and in regard to the specific circumstances of this case, the adverse impacts of granting a planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Even in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined at Framework paragraph 11 would not apply.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR