



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 January 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/24/3349211

Stafford House, 1 All Saints Road, Bristol BS8 2JE

- 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 Mr Oliver Hazell against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/05771/F.
 - The development proposed is the removal of non-original rear extensions; removal of existing pitched roofs to allow for one new principal roof extensions and loft conversion; and proposed rear extensions to the lower, ground and first floors. Change of use from 2 dwellings to 1.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of non-original rear extensions; removal of existing pitched roofs to allow for one new principal roof extensions and loft conversion; and proposed rear extensions to the lower, ground and first floors. Change of use from 2 dwellings to 1 at Stafford House, Bristol BS8 2JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/05771/F, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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: Site Location Plan S2_P03, Proposed Site Plan S2_P07, Proposed North West elevation S2_P07, Proposed South East elevation S2_P07, Proposed South West Elevation S2_P07, Proposed North East elevation S2_P05, Proposed sections S2_P07, Proposed roof plan, S2_P07, Proposed lower ground floor plan S2_P04, Proposed ground floorplan S2_P07, Proposed first floor plan S2_P07, Proposed second floor plan S2_P07.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 4) The photovoltaic roof system shall not be installed until details, including location, dimensions, design/technical specifications have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. An additional document showing illustrations of the proposed scheme has been submitted with the appeal. The additional submitted information does not include any alterations to the proposed scheme which interested parties of the opportunity may have wished to comment on, and as such natural justice would not be harmed by my consideration of these illustrations.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and whether it would preserve or enhance the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the Whiteladies Road CA. I observed that the significance of CA is in part derived from the quality of the buildings, with impressive Victorian villas evident.
5. The Whiteladies Road CA Enhancement Statement (1993) states how the character of district area 1, where the appeal site is located, relies on the subtle combination of 'mainly domestic qualities which are solidly built, substantial properties' with 'interesting and varied elevational use of classical architectural motifs'. The document identifies traffic and movement as the greatest threat to the character of the CA, in particular high density roadside parking which is considered to detract from the quality of the street scene.
6. All Saints Road is characterised mainly by large consistent three storey semi-detached Victorian villas above a basement level. These are faced in stone with low profile hipped roofs. However, the appeal property sits near the junction with Pembroke Road and is neighboured to the side, rear and front by more substantial apartment buildings of varying design. It consists of a two storey (at its frontage) detached property, which currently has a separate unit on its lower ground floor. Its scale and form contrasts with the prevailing character of the buildings on All Saints Road and to the rear on Thorndale Mews, and as such there is no unified character or rhythm to the immediate surroundings.
7. The property has a number of sizable rear additions which have resulted in a loss of original form, and which detract from its original character. Nevertheless, the frontage of the dwelling retains the simple original 1930's design, and as such, the property has a modest positive contribution to the wider character and appearance of the street scene and significance of the CA.
8. The proposal would not extend the existing footprint of the dwelling and it would extend to the rear above the existing lower ground floor projection. Given the scale of the existing property, which is three storeys at the rear, its width and height would not result in an excessive addition in terms of its scale or bulk. It would not dominate the existing property nor disrupt its hierarchy and would sit comfortably within the existing plot. The design of the rear additions, including the two minor rear dormers, hipped roof and addition of large areas of glazing would result in a coherent and unified design that improves upon the existing piecemeal rear elevation.

9. The works to the frontage are restricted to the roof extension, resulting in a simplified principal roof, new windows, including replacing the existing garage door and the extending of the brick plinth. The frontage character would therefore be retained, and improved. Given the scale and variety of the immediately surrounding buildings, the proposal would not appear out of keeping nor harm the existing character of the street scene. Given the retained off street parking, there would no alteration to roadside parking. The positive contribution of the dwelling to the significance of the CA would be preserved.
10. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would preserve the character and appearance of the Whiteladies Road CA. There is therefore no conflict with Policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27, DM30 and DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2014), which collectively, amongst other matters, require high quality design that safeguards or enhances heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. Whilst adding massing to the rear elevation, given the retained existing separation distances, the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the existing outlook from any rear or side facing fenestration to the neighbouring apartment buildings, or any other property.

Conditions

12. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions that it considers would be appropriate. I have considered these in light of the Planning Practice Guidance and the test set out in the Framework. For clarity and to ensure compliance with the tests, I have amended some of the Council's suggested wording.
13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, and those stated above, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty.
14. In order to ensure that the finished appearance of the development is appropriate to the CA setting and the high standard of materials used nearby, conditions requiring the submission and approval of materials is necessary.
15. Similarly, as they would be visible in glimpses from the highway, a condition is also necessary requiring details of the proposed solar tiles in order to ensure they are in keeping with the roof and overall appearance of the property.
16. The existing rear terrace area above the lower ground floor projection does not have any side screening, and views are possible of the rear of both adjacent buildings. Notwithstanding this, the rear of both properties is mostly taken up by car parking, and the small private garden to the rear of All Saints Mansions is directly overlooked by the upper floor units.
17. The proposed development would make the terrace to the appeal property smaller and would not increase the level of possible overlooking. As such, a condition relating to privacy screens does not meet the test of necessity.

Conclusion

18. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR