



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2025

By G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3348313

22 Allington Road, Bristol, BS3 1PS

- 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 Frances Edwards against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/04695/H.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with L shaped dormer and rear 2 storey infill extension at basement and ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with L shaped dormer and rear 2 storey infill extension at basement and ground floor level at 22 Allington Road, Bristol, BS3 1PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/04695/H, 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: (3)001; (3)002; (3)003; (3)004A; (3)005A; (3)006B & (3)007C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. This is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bedminster Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The application property is an end of terrace dwelling at the northern limit of the CA. It is comprised within Character Area 7 of the CA as identified in the Council's CA Appraisal. The property is shown on a map within the Appraisal as a '*character*' building, along with many other buildings or terraces in the character area. There are but a few listed buildings in the character area, but other buildings and terraces are identified as '*unlisted buildings of merit*' or '*grouped buildings of merit*', that is, of a seemingly higher local designation than the appeal property.
4. The officer report says that '*the dwelling forms part of a terrace of four which are generally uniform and architecturally balanced from the principle (sic) elevations.*' I noted that the original ground floor bay on the appeal property had been lost, and

replaced with a picture window, and the same has occurred on the adjoining, next door property.

5. Moreover, a new dwelling has been added, virtually as an extension, to the former end of terrace property, No 28, a short distance to the west. The new dwelling's contrasting design and non-matching materials are such that the previous unity and symmetry of the small terrace has been materially affected. Indeed, the new dwelling is characterised as a negative building in the Appraisal.
6. The Council considers the proposal to reinstate the bay at the front to be appropriate and acceptable. Regarding the proposed rear infill extension, the officer report says that it:

'...is considered to respect the general architectural character of both the application dwelling and wider area as well as maintain subservience to the host dwelling. Given its siting to the rear of the property, it would not be visible from the public realm and as such would not detrimentally impact the streetscape or wider CA.'

7. I share the Council's view on both aspect of the proposals, for the same reasons.
8. Thus, of the 3 elements of change proposed, it is the alterations to the roof which concerns the Council. Most of the proposed structure as it affects the roof's profile would be sited to the rear of the existing roof light or lantern, which despite its protrusive form is hardly apparent from the street outside.
9. The designer's attempts to marry the proposed structure with the existing roof profile, especially to the side, have succeeded and would ensure that the alterations would barely be noticeable from the street outside given that the most prominent front part of the sloping side roof would be unaffected. The roof form would be altered at the rear and could be seen by neighbours, none of whom have objected. However, the rear alterations would not be apparent in the public realm and, in applying a test similar to that adopted by the Council for the lower rear extension, would not detrimentally impact the streetscape or wider CA.
10. Whilst sharing the Council's assessment of two aspects of the appellant's proposals, I disagree with its assessment in respect of the third the third. At worse, the alterations to the roof would have a neutral effect on the CA as a whole, and its character and appearance would thus be preserved.
11. In conclusion, I find the development to be acceptable and compliant with those aspects of Core Strategy Policies BCS21 & BCS22, Local Plan Policies DM26, DM27, DM30 & DM31 directed to achieving good quality urban design contributing positively to local character and distinctiveness and ensuring that the City's heritage assets are appropriately conserved.

Conditions

12. The Council's suggested condition that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is imposed in the interests of certainty, as will its suggested condition relating to materials, in the interests of visual amenity.

Other matters

13. The Council's comments on the appellant's initial heritage statement have been noted. However, the significance of the CA, the heritage asset, is well rehearsed in the Appraisal and I have been considerably assisted in this regard by its content.

14. All other matters raised have been taken into account, including the various references to the *National Planning Policy Framework* and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document directed to designing house extensions and alterations, but no other matter is of such significance as to outweigh those considerations that led to my conclusions.
15. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR