



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/24/3347960

200 Kingsway, St George, Bristol BS5 8NX

- 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 Dipesh Chudasama against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/002206/H.
 - The development proposed is a dropped kerb /vehicle crossover application for driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the site and area.

Reasons

3. I recognise that in other parts of Kingsway and nearby areas breaks in boundary walls to form driveways are commonplace. However, the section of Kingsway in which the appeal site is located includes a strong development pattern of groups of terraced houses with front gardens bordered by largely unaltered stone boundary walls. Due to its length, uniformity and quality materials, the boundary wall on this side of Kingsway is a key attractive feature within the streetscene.
4. The proposed removal of the entire width of the stone boundary wall to the front of the appellant's home would create a gap which would unacceptably disrupt the uniformity of the properties and their boundary walls. I acknowledge that the site is not located within a Conservation Area. Nonetheless, the proposed removal of the wall would be at odds with, and would unduly harm, the character and appearance of both the appeal site and this section of Kingsway.
5. In conclusion, the appeal proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the site and area. Consequently, it would conflict with Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) Policy BCS21, Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) Policies DM21, DM26, DM27 and DM30 and the provisions of Section 12 of the Framework and Supplementary Planning Document 2, A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions. Taken together these seek to secure high quality design which retains as much of original walling as possible and contributes positively to local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

6. I recognise that the Council considers the scheme to be acceptable from a highway safety viewpoint and I have no reason to disagree. I also recognise the sustainability benefits that securing an EV charging point would have. I have therefore attributed moderate weight to these matters in considering the appeal. However, neither of these matters, on their own or cumulatively, would outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the site and area.

Conclusion

7. I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR