



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: 5th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3354543

25 Woodleigh Gardens, Bristol, BS14 9JA

- 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 Tim Dalton against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01181/H.
 - The development proposed is rear side dormer attic conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies at the southern end of Woodleigh Gardens in what is effectively a cul-de-sac comprised of a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying designs, all set out in a formal suburban manner. The property is a detached dwelling of a conventional, not unattractive design of its' age with a fairly shallow double hipped roof.
4. The intention is to add accommodation at roof level by means of a U-shaped extension comprised, in effect, of two side and a rear flat-roofed box dormers joined together.
5. The roof's appearance would be transformed by the addition. The appellant suggests that most of the impact would be to the rear, out of the public gaze. To an extent, that would be the case, but nevertheless both side dormers would be clearly visible at the front from the public highway. To my mind, their size, bulk and poor and rather crude design would make them appear as incongruous features harming not only the character and appearance of the host property but of the surrounding area.
6. The appellant points to examples of other roof alterations in the locality, but I saw none of such an excessive size, as proposed. Moreover, whilst a side dormer exists at 29 Woodleigh Gardens and a rear dormer is currently under construction on its attached neighbour, I saw little or no evidence of roof alterations on the other several houses in this part of the cul-de-sac. The local roofscape, with one or two

exceptions, is therefore relatively unspoilt. The proposal, if built, would therefore stand out conspicuously and unacceptably.

7. In conclusion, I find the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those aspects of Core Strategy Policies BCS21 and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30¹ directed to achieving good quality urban design contributing positively to local character and distinctiveness, including proposals affecting existing buildings.

Other matters

8. All other matters raised have been taken into account, including the various references to the National Planning Policy Framework and supplementary planning guidance. I am content that any potential overlooking could be addressed by condition had the appeal succeeded.
9. No other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh those considerations that led to my conclusions.
10. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ Of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (LP)