



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3338212

37 Chelsea Park, Easton, Bristol, BS5 6AH

- 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 B Arnold against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00825/H, dated 27 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a front dormer at 37 Chelsea Park, Easton, Bristol, BS5 6AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00825/H, dated 27 February 2023, and the plans numbered 4208/P.1 A and 4208/P2 A.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my visit, I saw that the dormer had been installed and that externally the works were largely complete.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey terraced dwelling with a shallow front garden within a residential locality comprising similar properties with a tight urban grain. The property, in-keeping with others, has a two-storey bay window feature with a pitched, turret style roof, which is subservient to the ridge height of the main roof. The installed dormer is to one side of the turret roof and is traditionally constructed with a gabled, pitched roof.
5. Dormer windows are not original features to the terraced properties along Chelsea Park and the surrounding similar roads. Neither are they common. Nevertheless, some occasionally do feature, along with other roof modifications including front facing solar panels, rooflights of various sizes and replacement/alternative roof tiles. Nothing I observed from my deliberately targeted observations of the roofscapes were overtly intrusive or drawn by the eye within the fairly narrow and constrained vistas of the street scenes. I saw the same to be true for the dormer at No 37, which is modest in size, well-

proportioned and adequately framed by the existing front roof slope, complementary to the overall composition of the building, and sympathetically finished with materials to match. I found it neither prominent nor unsympathetic.

6. I note that the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 - A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions* (SPD), adopted in 2005, states that an essential design characteristic for an acceptable dormer window is that they are located only on side or rear roof pitches. The proposal would conflict with this advice, but in every other aspect, I find compliance with the SPD's other essential design characteristics for dormer windows. Most significantly, for reasons amplified above, I have found no detrimental effect upon the character or appearance of the property or wider street scene.
7. The Council has identified conflict with Policy DM29 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies – Adopted July 2014, and Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy – Adopted June 2011. Policy DM29 deals with new buildings as opposed to an alteration to an existing building. I am unable to identify any conflict with the criteria listed within Policy DM29. Based on my overall findings I am satisfied that the development at 37 Chelsea Park demonstrates a design quality that enables it to be positively assimilated into the character and identity of its local area, as required by Policy BCS21.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed. As the development has already taken place there is no requirement for any conditions.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR