



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

**by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 20 December 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/24/3348828**

**Stanley Yard, 1A Stanley Road, Redland, Bristol BS6 6NP**

- 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 Tim & Lizzie Freeman & O'Neill against the decision of Bristol City Council.
  - The application Ref is 23/03512/F.
  - The development proposed is a self-build three bedroom, three storey family dwelling. Change of use of land from private storage yard to single residential dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including the Cotham and Redland Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a vacant plot on Stanley Road, which comprises a stepped terrace of 3-storey stone-fronted properties, with the lower ground floor level sitting partially below road level. Dwellings are generally high quality and set back from the road behind low boundary walls. 2 Stanley Road, which sits opposite the appeal site, is taller than other buildings within the row, nonetheless this building is consistent with others in the row in terms of form, materials and fenestration pattern, and there is a consistent architectural rhythm to the properties on Stanley Road.
4. The site is located within the Cotham and Redland Conservation Area (CA), a principally residential area characterised by a high-quality Victorian townscape within a sloping topography and leafy context. The significance of the CA as a heritage asset is, in part, derived from the various scales and forms of period properties along with a rich landscape quality and verdant character. Given its scale, a variety of architectural styles and materials are found within the CA. The Cotham & Redland Character Appraisal & Management Proposals (2011) sets out that terraced streets within the CA, including Stanley Road, are united by a strong building line and consistent palette of materials. The coherence and architectural harmony of the properties on Stanley Road makes a positive contribution to the surrounding area and to this part of the CA.
5. The proposal is for a 3-storey dwelling. The dwelling would have a striking contemporary design and recessed upper floors. The dwelling has taken some architectural cues from the nearby terrace including through the incorporation

of banded brick detailing, stone mullions and the use of limestone. It would be consistent in height with the pitched ridge of the adjoining terrace and would be consistent in depth with other dwellings in the row.

6. The width of the main projecting section of the dwelling would be consistent with the width of other dwellings within the terrace. Nonetheless, taking into consideration the 3-storey recess, which itself would be highly visible from the street scene, the width of the dwelling would result in a proposal which would be markedly wider and bulkier than the modest dwellings in the row. Its modern, flat, boxy design and contrasting fenestration would diverge starkly from the forms prevalent in Stanley Road. Furthermore, the recesses to the upper floors would break up the characteristic rhythm within the terrace. These bold architectural elements would jar with, rather than reinforce, locally distinctive features, presenting a façade that would not be visually coherent within the established street scene, disrupting the balance and rhythm of dwellings within the row.
7. Street scene views of the rear of the building would be restricted due to the presence of built form. Nonetheless, this roof form would be visible from neighbouring properties, where the sloped staggered form would contrast markedly with the rhythm of roof forms within the row, thereby appearing incongruent.
8. I recognise the sources of inspiration for the proposal and acknowledge that the appellant has sought to design a dwelling which is subservient to the adjacent terrace, and that a contemporary design has been utilised to differentiate the dwelling from the terrace. However, for the reasons I have outlined, I find the design proposed would fail to maintain the rhythm of the terrace or achieve a sympathetic form of development.
9. The harm that would arise would be localised and therefore the impact on the CA as a whole is less than substantial within the meaning of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The Framework indicates that less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In weighing the public benefits of the proposal against the harm identified it would develop an under-used windfall site and would contribute a new energy-efficient, self-build dwelling to the local housing stock on a site at low risk of flooding in a location which is accessible to local facilities and services. The dwelling has been designed to high energy standards and there would be social and economic benefits from the construction of the dwelling.
10. However, given the scale of the development, such benefits would only provide limited weight in favour of the proposal. Taken together the public benefits accruing from the proposal are limited. I therefore find that there is no significant public benefit that would outweigh the harm that I have found to the CA.
11. In light of the above, I find that the proposed dwelling would undermine the distinctive character of the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA as a heritage asset. I therefore find conflict with those aims of Bristol Core Strategy (2011) policy BCS22 and Bristol Allocations and Development Management Policies Document (2014) policies DM26 and DM31 which require new development to be high quality, respect the overall design and character of an area and contribute positively to

an area's local character, as well as safeguarding local distinctiveness and important heritage assets.

### **Other Matters**

12. The appellant suggests that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. Nonetheless, even if this were the case, bullet i of Paragraph 11.d of the Framework clarifies that permission should not be granted if the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, including heritage assets, provide a clear reason for refusing the development. Given my conclusions in relation to the effect of the proposal on a heritage asset (the CA), this provides a clear reason for refusing the development. Given this, in any case the proposal would not benefit from the presumption in favour of development.
13. The Council did not raise any objections to the principle of the proposal, nor did they object on grounds of the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, the standard of proposed living environment, the effect of the proposal on the highway network or in relation to the provision of bin and cycle storage. Based on the information before me I see no reason to take a differing view. However, compliance with the relevant development plan policies on these matters would be required in any case. Therefore, these matters weigh neutrally, rather than in favour of the proposal. Additionally, whilst it is stated that proposed planting would encourage biodiversity, there is limited detail of this before me to give substantial credence to.
14. My attention has been drawn to a planning permission<sup>1</sup> which has been approved since the determination of the application subject of this appeal. It is stated that the appeal proposal would have a satisfactory relationship with this development. However, as I have concluded that the proposal would result in harm in relation to the main issue, I have not gone on to consider the implications of the appeal proposal on this permission.

### **Conclusion**

15. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*N Robinson*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Application reference 23/01285/F