



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3358597 13 Risdale Road, Ashton, Bristol, BS3 2QU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr G Gilliatt against the decision of Bristol City Council.
- The application Ref: 24/04200/H, dated 23 October 2024, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2024.
- The development proposed is 'Double storey side extension and part double storey, part single storey rear extension'.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double storey side extension and part double storey, part single storey rear extension to 13 Risdale Road, Ashton, Bristol, BS3 2QU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 24/04200/H, dated 23 October 2024, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. There are some small drafting errors on the application drawings between the proposed first floor plan, front elevation and side elevation on drawing number 4306.PL2.04 A, specifically in relation to the projecting canopy and pitched roof above the front portion of the lounge. However, these discrepancies are sufficiently minor such that the scope of development is clearly understandable, and they do not present an obstacle to my determination of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The character of the area immediately surrounding the appeal site is residential, generally consisting of two-storey terraced properties constructed in the post-war period, but with some isolated semi-detached properties. The roof pattern is generally hipped in nature to the end terrace properties, in a mix of smooth red/brown clay tile, slate and profiled concrete tiles. The walls to properties in the area are generally finished in a mixture of dashed or smooth render, the majority of which have been painted with masonry paint, although there are also some more modern brick-built dwellings present.

5. The appeal site is the end property in a terrace of four dwellings and is two-storey with single storey extensions to the rear. The terrace has hipped roofs to the properties at both ends. There is an adjacent further terrace of five dwellings to the north, many of which have also been the subject of extensions. These include significant flat roofed areas to the rear roof-slopes and the removal of the hipped gable. The northern-most dwelling of this terrace, which forms the corner of Risdale Road with Trevanna Road has also been extended with a full depth two-storey extension with hipped roof, showing no set-back of the extension from the front elevation, either at ground or first floor level.
6. The proposals would introduce a two-storey extension to the side of and projecting to part of the rear of the existing property. The upper storey would be set back from the front elevation by approximately 1m, whilst the ground floor would be maintained in line with the existing front elevation. A projecting pitched roof over this area replaces an existing projecting roof canopy over the entrance door, and thereby the two elements would be visually integrated at this location. The ridge lines of the side extension would be set at a level below that of the main roof, whilst the ridge line of the rear projecting gable roof would also be set down further and is finished in a hip to its end.
7. The modelling of the proposed extension establishes a hierarchy. The extension would therefore read as being subservient to the existing dwelling, its massing would read as part of, and would be countered by, that of the wider terrace. Given this context, the extension would not be out of scale with the existing dwelling, appearing subservient and in proportion to the wider terrace. The form proposed also closely follows that held up as being acceptable on p10 of the Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 - 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (2005).
8. The closest property on Tregarth Road (number 2) is approximately 30m from the appeal property, and the trajectory of the building line of the Tregarth Road properties relative to the appeal property indicates that the existing property is already in front of it. Having reviewed the relationship of the building line of the properties on the adjacent Trevanna Road with the end terrace corner property at 29 Risdale Road (no.29), no.29 projects considerably in front of the building line of the Trevanna Road properties with no ill effects. Accordingly, I find that the relationship of the appeal proposals would have a similar relationship and consequently, would not be harmful.
9. Therefore, on that basis, I do not find that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property, or the area. It follows that I find no conflict with policies DM26, DM27, DM28 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014) or policy BCS21 of the adopted Bristol Core Strategy (2011) which, among other things, seek high quality design that respects local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. I note the concerns raised by residents in relation to parking provision and the impact of construction traffic. The highways authority does not object to the proposal and consider the drop kerb and driver visibility relative to the junction to be acceptable. I note that the property also has the benefit of a single garage in addition to the parking space. I further note that construction traffic would not be

likely to present a long-term issue, being temporary for the limited duration of the construction period, and to a level that would reflect the limited scope of the proposals.

Residents have also raised concerns regarding impact on privacy, on the loss of wildlife habitat and potential for future development. Given the proposed separation distances and configuration of the proposal relative to other properties, I am satisfied that the impact on the living conditions of residents would be acceptable. The appeal site does not contain any protected vegetation and as such, planning permission is not required for its removal, though disturbance to habitat for nesting birds is prevented by other specific legislation. Finally, the remit for my determination relates to that shown on the submitted plans rather than potential future development.

Conditions

11. Commencement and plans conditions are required in the interests of certainty. A materials condition is required to ensure that proposed materials match those of the existing property in the interests of visual coherence.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposals would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property or the wider area. They would therefore comply with the development plan as a whole, and that there are no material considerations that would justify making a determination other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR

Schedule

- 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 drawings: Site Location Plan 4306.PL2.01; Existing and Proposed Block Plans 4306.PL2.02 A and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations 4306.PL2.04 A.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.