



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2024

by T Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/23/3330806

Top Floor Flat, 7 Acramans Road, Bristol BS3 1DQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Elaine Carr against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/04472/F.
 - The development proposed is loft extension to top floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft extension to top floor flat at Top Floor Flat, 7 Acramans Road, Bristol BS3 1DQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/04472/F, and subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2023. However, as its provisions that are most relevant to this appeal have not materially changed, no parties will have been prejudiced by my having regard to the latest version in reaching my decision.
3. As the proposal is in a conservation area (CA), I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, as set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to the CA.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is an elegant semi-detached Victorian property. Whilst in the middle of a row of three flat-roof buildings with similar architectural features, materials, fenestration and parapets, the adjoining semi-detached property (No 5 Acramans Road) has a roof projection and I observed on my site visit that the southern-most building (containing Nos 1 and 3) has a somewhat altered and stepped form. The site does not therefore form part of a significant row of properties with a consistent form and appearance such as, as I observed on my site visit, on the north side of South Ville Place. Furthermore, although built form in the surrounding area has a generally traditional and well-designed character, the mixture of building types and forms gives the locality a varied appearance. For example, there are terraced, semi-detached and detached buildings with various designs, including some with obvious alterations and

extensions, within the immediate vicinity of the site. There are also several roof extensions visible in nearby surrounding streets. The surrounding area therefore also has a relatively mixed pattern and limited sense of rhythm.

6. Although the decision notice refers to the Clifton CA, the submitted evidence indicates that the site is actually within the Bedminster CA. Based on the available evidence, the CA's significance stems from, amongst other things, its historical nature with the large number of fine Georgian and Victorian buildings, including terraces and villas. The host building is defined as a character building by the Council's Bedminster Conservation Area Character Appraisal. However, it is not identified as making an especially significant contribution to the CA, unlike for example those buildings defined by the Appraisal as unlisted (or grouped) buildings of merit. Accordingly, whilst positively contributing to its well-designed context and sense of place, the building does not stand out as a particularly important or special feature in the CA as a whole.
7. The proposed mansard would cover much of the roof and extend above the parapet. However, much of it would be screened by the parapet's relatively high wall. It would also be set back from the front and rear, whilst the design would mean that its height would be less on its sides. Consequently, only the top-most section of the mansard would be visible in public views; and due to the presence and position of surrounding buildings, topography and existing planting providing some screening on Acramans Road, it would generally only be visible in relatively short distance glimpsed views. I observed on my visit that the site is also not in a particularly prominent or sensitive location.
8. Given the above, and due to the position and relatively limited scale of the proposed development, the mansard would have a limited presence in the streetscene and would not read as a crude, visually intrusive or dominating feature. With roof extensions present in the locality, including on other character buildings, some having similar mansard-type designs, and the roof projection on the adjoining property, the proposed mansard would also read as a congruous addition that would not disrupt the pattern and rhythm of development in the locality. In addition, with its finish in natural slates, it would use materials present in the surrounding area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and although the appeal proposal cannot reasonably be described as enhancing the CA, it would preserve the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset. I therefore find that it accords with Policies BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.
10. Amongst other aspects, these policies expect extensions to be physically and visually subservient to the host building and seek high quality development that contributes to the creation of quality urban design and local character and distinctiveness; responds to the area's scale, character and historic assets; and respects the host building and broader street scene. The proposal would also be consistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment and the design guidelines in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 (A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions).

Other matters

11. Although not a reason for refusal, the Council's Delegated Report sets out that the proposed development would enable additional overlooking of neighbouring properties. However, whilst the mansard would include various openings, the extent of overlooking would be restricted due to the height of the existing parapet and angle and position of the openings. Any additional overlooking would also be limited relative to the existing situation, which includes mutual overlooking between various properties, including from the existing flats on the site. Accordingly, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers through unacceptable overlooking.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised and the submitted evidence, I conclude that the proposed development accords with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.
13. The Council has not suggested any conditions. However, I have imposed the standard time limit and plans conditions in the interests of clarity and certainty. To ensure a high-quality appearance, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the proposed development is finished in the materials identified in the planning application form.

T Gethin

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing and proposed east elevation (Drawing No 2207-PL-01); Existing and proposed west elevation (Drawing No 2207-PL-02); Existing and proposed north elevation (Drawing No 2207-PL-03); Existing and proposed roof plan (Drawing No 2207-PL-04); Existing plans (Drawing No 2207-PL-05); Proposed plans first floor and loft extension (Drawing No 2207-PL-06); Proposed site section (Drawing No 2207-PL-09); Site plan and block plan (Drawing No 2207-PL-10); and Existing and proposed south elevation (Drawing No 2207-PL-11).
- 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials detailed in the planning application form.

END OF SCHEDULE