



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by J Evans BA(Hons) AssocRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/23/3336138

1 Egerton Road, Bristol BS7 8HN

- 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 Helen Laird against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/05803/H, dated 5 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the removal of existing rear lean-to and replacement with single storey full width rear extension. Proposed new mansard roof to replace existing hip roofs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of existing rear lean-to and replacement with single storey full width rear extension. Proposed new mansard roof to replace existing hip roofs, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 22/05803/H, dated 5 December 2022, 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: Drawing No.010 - Site location and block plan, dated 5.12.2022; Drawing No. 011 - Existing floor plans, dated 5.12.2022; Drawing No. 012 - Existing elevations, dated 5.12.2022; Drawing No.021 Rev A - Proposed floor plans, dated 30.06.2023; Drawing No. 022 Rev A - Proposed elevations, dated 30.06.2023; and Drawing No.023 Rev A- Proposed roof plan and imagery, dated 30.06.2023.
 - 3) Prior to the installation of the exterior materials to be used on the mansard roof, further details of the PV slate effect tiles and the aluminium surround to the dormer windows to be used, shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. During the processing of the appeal proposal by the Council, the appellant submitted revised plans¹, however, the Council advised that as they were opposed to the proposed mansard roof extension more broadly than in terms of

¹ Drawing No.021 Rev A - Proposed floor plans, dated 30.06.2023; Drawing No. 022 Rev A - Proposed elevations, dated 30.06.2023; and Drawing No.023 Rev A- Proposed roof plan and imagery, dated 30.06.2023.

the detail of its proposed appearance, they would not accept the revised plans. As the proposed revisions in summary reduce the alterations to the existing parapet wall to the appeal property, revise the openings on the front elevation of the proposed mansard roof from three to two, and marginally reduce the overall form of the mansard roof, they would not materially change the proposal before me. I am therefore satisfied that the revisions would not prejudice any interested party having regard to the Wheatcroft principles². As a consequence, I have accepted the revised plans and I have determined the appeal proposal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached end of terrace two storey dwelling built to the latter part of the C19 and is situated toward the lower end of Egerton Road. The property forms part of a linear group of three similar styled dwellings, which step down towards the appeal property, following the topography of the road. The style of properties along Egerton Road provides for a pleasing mix, with differentiation in form, massing, appearance and detailing. Like the appeal property and the two properties leading to the west, there are also occasions are small groupings of consistency, but nonetheless, the overall perception is of a varied street scene.
5. The appeal development proposes a number of alterations to the existing property, however the Council's concerns as set out in their decision notice are specific to the effects of the proposed mansard roof. Having visited the appeal site and reviewed all of the documents before me, I agree with the Council that the wider alterations to the rear of the appeal property are acceptable.
6. With regard to the proposed mansard roof, it is evident to me that whilst this would represent a noticeable change to the appearance of the appeal property, I am of the view that this change would sit comfortably with the characteristics of the existing building and the context of the wider street scene as I have set out above. This would be as a result of: the low profile of the mansard roof which would be sited behind and stepped away from the existing parapet walling on the front elevation; the location of the mansard roof behind an existing chimney and its stepped positioning away from the more exposed side elevation of the appeal property facing towards Gloucester Road; the proposed angled profile of the mansard roof; the finish of the proposed exterior materials, and the backdrop of building mass behind from the predominance of public vantage points.
7. As a consequence, I am satisfied that the appeal development would have no harmful impact on the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area. The appeal development would therefore accord with Policy BSC21 of the Bristol Development Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) adopted June 2011 and Policy DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (the Site Allocations and Development Management document) adopted July 2014, which amongst other

² Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd vs. Secretary of State for the Environment [JPL 1982]

matters, seek development to achieve high standards of urban design that contribute towards local character and distinctiveness and respect the overall design and character of the host building. The proposal would also accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which amongst other matters requires development to be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Conditions

8. The standard time limit is required together with a condition listing the plans in the interests of certainty. I have also included a condition that requires details of the material and finish of the PV slate effect tiles and aluminium surround to the dormer windows to be used on the mansard roof, to ensure that the development is carried out to a sufficient standard of quality.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Evans

INSPECTOR