



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/23/3333788

1 Somerset Terrace, Bedminster, Bristol, BS3 4LL

- 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 Peter Croft against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/05738/H, dated 30 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with concealed roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to an end property in a terrace of 8 houses, next to an entrance to Victoria Park. Its rear garden runs along the side of the park up to the end of Nutgrove Avenue which continues along the edge of the park. Consequently, the rear of the appeal site and other houses within the terrace are visible from the end of Nutgrove Avenue and from within Victoria Park.
4. The appeal property is significantly larger than other houses within the terrace. It sits slightly forward and is wider with a side, rather than front, entrance. The parapet wall at the front is higher than on other houses and the rear of the property extends further back than the rest of the terrace. All the houses within the terrace have butterfly roofs which, although hidden by parapet walls from the street, are visible from the park and thus contribute to the character and appearance of the terrace and wider area. The roof of the appeal property particularly stands out because of its size and prominent location.
5. The proposed development would replace the butterfly roof with a mainly flat roof, sloped at the side and front, behind a raised parapet wall. The butterfly roof would thus be infilled and squared off. A roof terrace to the side and rear would result in the roof extension sitting back from the wall such that views of it would be limited. Nonetheless, the higher parapet wall would lead to the building dominating the end of the terrace which would be made more apparent by the loss of the butterfly roof, which not only reflects the design of the wider terrace but also breaks up the mass of the host property. The result would be a more visually intrusive building out of keeping with the terrace of which it is

part, harming both the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Local Plan, Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27, and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) which require high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

6. I note that the appellant has submitted a Lawful Development Certificate application to infill the butterfly roof. However, that is a matter for the Council to determine and as such I accord it little weight.
7. I have had regard to concerns raised regarding privacy and the historic significance of the terrace. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on the main issues for the reasons given above, I have not pursued these matters further.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR