



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: 21 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/24/3351335

11 Frome Valley Road, Stapleton, Bristol BS16 1HF

- 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 H Bisla against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02619/F.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to form 2 no 1-bedroom flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. Since the submission of the appeal a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published in December 2024 and subsequently amended in February 2025. Although I have made my determination against the updated national policy context, the relevant changes are not fundamental to matters which are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are;
 - i. The effect on the character and appearance of the site and area; and
 - ii. Whether the scheme would meet sustainable transport requirements and provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, in relation to the provision of cycle and bin storage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Taken together Bristol Core Strategy (2011) (CS) Policy BCS21, Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (SADMP) DM21, DM26 and DM27 and Section 12 of the Framework seek to secure high quality development which positively responds to the character and appearance of the site and area.
5. The appeal property occupies a prominent position at the junction of Frome Valley Road with Alberton Road. Although there are nearby commercial properties, the dwelling sits within a predominantly residential area. Along with the opposing pair of semi-detached houses, the appeal property and adjoining dwelling, are orientated to address the street corner and form a gateway to the wholly residential part of

Frome Valley Road. This area is characterised by largely semi-detached homes. Whilst many dwellings have been extended, the separation space between pairs of semis on Frome Valley Road has generally been retained. Consequently, the rhythm of the street has been safeguarded.

6. The proposed two-storey side extension would include a footprint which would in-fill the space to the side of the appeal property, bringing it close to neighbouring dwelling No 13. This would unacceptably erode the separation distance between these properties. It would fail to respond to the established development pattern and would appear as overdevelopment. The visual impact of the proposal would be exacerbated by the prominent corner position of the site. Consequently, the scheme would be at odds with, and unduly harm, the character and appearance of the site and area.
7. I note that the proposed extension would reflect the scale, building line and materials of existing properties on Frome Valley Road. I also acknowledge that Policy DM21 supports the efficient use of land and that the scheme would retain adequate garden space for existing residents. However, as I have described, the scheme would unacceptably in-fill the space between properties and therefore overall would be at odds with the existing character and appearance of the site and area.
8. In view of the above, overall, the proposed development is contrary to CS Policy BCS21 and Policies DM21, DM26 and DM27 of the SADMP, as well as Section 12 of the Framework.

Sustainable transport and living conditions

9. The proposed site layout indicates that secure cycle storage would be provided within the rear garden of the site. Similarly, a bin store would be provided within the front garden. I am therefore satisfied that the appellant has demonstrated that both an enclosed, secure and weather-proof cycle store and a secure bin store could be provided for the proposed development.
10. Had the scheme be acceptable in all other regards, a condition could have been attached to a consent requiring the exact details of this provision to be agreed. The proposal would therefore meet sustainable transport requirements and provide a satisfactory standard of living conditions for existing and future occupiers. It would therefore accord with DMP Policy DM32 which requires development to include bin storage space and Section 9 of the Framework which seeks to promote sustainable forms of transport.

Planning Balance

11. The proposal is not in compliance with CS Policy BCS21 and Policies DM21, DM26 and DM27 of the SADMP insofar as it would result in development which would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and area. I consider the harm which would occur would be substantial.
12. These policies are consistent with the Framework which seeks to ensure that developments respond to local character. I therefore attach significant weight to the conflict with these policies.
13. The Framework states that the creation of high quality and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should

achieve. Moreover, paragraph 139 of the Framework states that development which is not well designed should be refused.

14. The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and as a result paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged. The Council confirms the current shortfall to be 3.54 years. However, in this instance, the importance of good design outweighs the provision of two flats.
15. Therefore, I find that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

16. The proposal conflicts with the policies in the development plan in respect of character and appearance. This outweighs the conformity with other policies of the plan. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR