



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/24/3349790

First And Second Floor Flat, 4 Seymour Road, Easton, Bristol BS5 0UN

- 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 Kimran Ali against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03361/F.
 - The development proposed is to erect a new loft space to the roof and alter the layout on first and second floor to enhance its layout overall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Council has raised no objections to the proposed first floor rear extension or the alterations to the internal layout. From the evidence before me, and from my own observations, I have no reasons to form a different view.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is part of a 3 storey, mid-terrace property. The appeal relates to the maisonette located above the ground floor café. The terrace has a relatively U-shaped layout and as such has three frontages, facing onto three different streets. The appeal property sits with five other properties in this part of the terrace that faces onto Seymour Road, next to the junction that leads onto Stapleton Road. These five dwellings share a similar appearance as they are rendered with a flat roof set behind a parapet wall, however, unlike the appeal property, three of these properties have only two storeys. The properties along Seymour Road are residential in nature, share similar roof types to this part of the terrace and appear to be between 2-4 stories. Buildings located on Stapleton Road appear to be mostly three stories and a mix of retail at ground floor with residential accommodation and office spaces above, or entirely residential. There is a mansard roof, similar to the

- proposed development, to one of the properties on the terrace which fronts onto Stapleton Road.
6. The proposed mansard roof would mean that the terrace would drop from 4 storeys to 2 storeys. This would be a considerable drop between the appeal property and the adjacent two storey properties on the terrace. The additional height of the proposal would appear as a jarring addition when viewed with the two-storey aspect of the terrace. As such, by virtue of its siting and scale, the proposal would dominate the appeal property and this aspect of the terrace. The existing parapet walls would only marginally cover the mansard roof from the front projection and the proposal would appear as a highly prominent feature when viewed from Seymour Road. There is a notable height difference between properties No.6-12 and No.14 Seymour Road. However, these dwellings do not share the same frontage or characteristics of this terrace. Therefore, the height difference does not appear as stark or as sudden as the proposal would.
 7. There is a varied roofscape in the area, however, the roofscape is mostly uniform within this terrace. In addition, there are not numerous mansard roofs found on surrounding properties, and therefore they do not form a significant part of the character of the area. The existing mansard roof to No.184 Stapleton Road was allowed at appeal and the appellant has submitted a copy of this decision¹. The Council also had regard to this decision in the consideration of the application.
 8. No.184 is, however, located on a different frontage that is a busy commercial road with a wide range of commercial properties. The current appeal property however, despite being on the same terrace, is located on a road that mostly comprises residential properties and is of a more subdued scale and nature. In addition, No.184 had a similar height to the properties either side. As such, the existing mansard roof did not significantly increase the scale of this part of the terrace and therefore did not create a significant storey drop, which would not be the case for the appeal proposal. Furthermore, the principal views of No.184 incorporate high-rise buildings in the background that appear as a similar height to the roof, which has reduced the impact. There are tower blocks nearby the appeal property, however these are not seen above the property in the background of principle views and therefore the impact would not be reduced in this case. The proposal would also leave a large gap between it and the existing mansard roof, which would not appear as cohesive. It is also pertinent that the previous appeal was considered against different local and national planning policies to the current scheme.
 9. Therefore, whilst I have had regard to the appeal decision at No.184, it is in a different context to the current site of the proposed development. It does not lead me to conclude in favour of the appeal, which I have in any event determined on its own individual planning merits.
 10. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and its terrace. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) which states that development should be of a high quality and positively contribute towards an area's character. The proposal would also conflict with Policies DM26 and DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2014). Together these policies state that extensions to existing buildings will be expected to respect

¹ Planning Appeal APP/Z0116/A/08/2081086

the scale, form and overall design and contribute towards local character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.

Other Matters

11. There would be some minor benefits to having larger bedrooms and more floorspace, however these would primarily be private benefits. In addition, the proposal uses a similar colour and materials to the existing mansard roof. However, these matters would be only of limited weight in favour of the appeal and would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR