



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3343385

48 St Johns Road, Bedminster, Bristol BS3 4JJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Wild against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01679/H
 - The development is a loft conversion with a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with a rear dormer at 48 St Johns Road, Bedminster, Bristol BS3 4JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01679/H and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant advises that the loft conversion and dormer extension were completed during the course of the planning application being considered. Therefore, I was able to view the development in situ on my site visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, including the Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires development to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
5. The appeal property is a Victorian terraced house which is located at the edge of the Bedminster Conservation Area (CA). The appeal site lies within Character Area 9: St John's Churchyard, as set out in the Bedminster Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2013) (CACA). The appeal dwelling forms part of the Victorian townscape described within the CACA and, along with all other properties within this terrace, is identified as a character building. However, it is the front of the property, rather than the rear which makes the most significant contribution to the CA. The rear of the property backs onto a commercial area which is outside of the CA and there are only limited views of it from within the CA.

6. I recognise that the dormer extension which is the subject of this appeal spans the full width of the dwelling and occupies a good part of the rear roof plane. As such, it does not reflect the guidance regarding dormer extensions that is included within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Number 2, A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005) (SPD). I also note that the Council refers to 'the undeveloped roof form of the application terrace'.
7. However, on my site visit I observed that neighbouring property No.44 St Johns Road, benefits from a very similar dormer roof extension. Consequently, the appellants' dormer extension does not look out of place within the context of the property itself or the row of terraced homes. Whilst I note the Council's comments that the neighbour's dormer was constructed without the need for planning consent prior to the designation of the Conservation Area, it nonetheless exists.
8. The dormer is not visible from the front of the property and there are only limited views of it from within CA. On my site visit I noted that there are views of the dormer extension from the wider area to the rear of the appeal site, including Sheene Road and Wesley Street. However, these are distant views, and the dormer is viewed in the context of a number of commercial uses and car parks, as well as the nearby dormer extension to No.44. As such, the dormer does not appear as overly prominent within the area and would not fundamentally change the surrounding street scene.
9. In view of the above, I conclude that the rear dormer does not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and preserves the character and appearance of the CA. Hence, I do not find conflict with Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) Policies BCS21, BCS22 and Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management (2014) Policies DM26, DM30, the SPD and the CACA. Taken together, these seek to secure good quality development which respects the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, including preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.

Conditions

10. The Council suggests conditions in respect of the timescale for commencement of development, materials and approved plans. Given that the works have already been completed, these conditions are unnecessary.

Conclusion

11. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR