



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/24/3352004

1 Quantock Road, Bristol, BS3 4PG

- 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 John Brown against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00942/H.
 - The development proposed is to extend existing roof to the rear to provide extra bedrooms, and an en-suite bathroom. Installation of external wall insulation to existing walls at rear and at end of terrace elevations. Solar panels to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposed development: (a) on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, and (b) on the living conditions of neighbouring residents with particular reference to overshadowing and visual impact.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is situated at the end of a terrace of almost identical, distinctive and attractive two storey dwellings. Next to it, to the north is 1a Quantock Road, a single storey property, formerly a shop, but which is now a dwelling. The appeal property's plain, northern flank wall backs onto No 1a's small rear garden, and beyond are the gardens and rear elevations of dwellings in Alfred Road.
4. The appellant proposes a similar development to that carried out on the other side of the road at 2 Quantock Road¹. In effect, a new floor would be added, accommodating two bedrooms and a bathroom. As was the case at No 2, the front of the new roof would be designed with a slope, so that when viewed from directly outside in the street, the additional bulk of the new roof would be screened by an existing parapet.
5. The additional height would however be clearly apparent above the side, northern elevation when viewed approaching the site from the road's junction with Alfred Road. The existing flank elevation is prominent and dominant in this part of the

¹ Granted on appeal Ref APP/Z0116/D/16/3162262 on 13 January 2017.

street, and the additional height envisaged, irrespective of the intention to use matching materials and colours, would significantly increase its prominence and accentuate its scale, bulk and dominance, unacceptably so. To my mind it would be significantly more apparent in the street scene than the side elevation of No 2, and this distinguishes the two cases.

6. In conclusion, and for the reasons above, 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 DM30² directed to achieving good quality urban design contributing positively to local character and distinctiveness, including proposals affecting existing buildings.

Living Conditions

7. The appeal property lies generally southwards of 1a Quantock Road and a small terrace of properties on Alfred Road, whose rear elevations and gardens face the site. As the appellant suggests, the locality is characterised by is a tightly-knit form of development, where a level of overshadowing and sense of enclosure is already experienced by many residents.
8. I share the appellant's view that the residents of 1a Quantock Road are unlikely to be greatly affected by the development since their property and garden is already visually dominated and overshadowed by the appeal property's northern wall. However, the residents of some of the properties in Alfred Road, notably those living in Nos 9,10 & 11, are in reasonably close proximity to the appeal property's imposing flank elevation.
9. The increase in height and bulk proposed would to my mind alter the current balance so that the heightened and extended side wall would appear dominating, especially when viewed from the most affected rear gardens. Residents would feel increasingly hemmed-in and oppressed. It is also inevitable, given the respective positions of the wall and gardens and the changing daily position of the sun that more overshadowing of these rear gardens would arise than may currently be the case at those times of the day when the gardens are most likely to be used. In the absence of a sunlight assessment, I rely on professional judgment in this respect, but I do not share the appellant's view that the effect on these residents' amenities would be '*minimal*'.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of some residents in Alfred Road by reasons of an adverse visual impact leading to a harmful increased perception of enclosure and unacceptable overshadowing. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those aspects of Core Strategy Policy BCS21 and LP Policy DM30 directed to ensuring that new development should not harm neighbouring residential amenities.

Other matters

11. All other matters raised have been taken into account, including the various references to the *National Planning Policy Framework* and supplementary planning guidance. I have also taken account of the representations made by various local

² Of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (LP)

residents. No other matter is of such significance as to outweigh those considerations that led to my conclusions.

12. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR