



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2025

by **L McKay MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3362039

32 Tranmere Avenue, Brentry, Bristol, BS10 7JL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Miss Maria Wojda against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04737/HAS.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'The proposal is to add an additional storey to this house, there would be little to no impact on any property as: No new windows are proposed in the side elevations. The proposals are in line with Permitted Development Class AA. Please refer to the submitted plans for full details.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by the construction of additional storeys, subject to specific limitations and conditions and a requirement that the developer applies for prior approval to the Local Planning Authority.
3. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposal would comply with the limitations in paragraph AA.1 and the conditions in paragraph AA.2.(2) of Class AA. There is also no dispute with regard to the prior approval matters in paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(i), (iii) or (iv). From the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

4. The only area of dispute relates to the prior approval matter in paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(ii). Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is in a residential area with a mixture of houses, bungalows and flats. While there is some variety in the design and scale of properties in the area, there is a clear consistency of design and scale across this two-storey terrace and the numerous other similar terraces locally. Some properties have been altered and extended, leading to minor differences in appearance, however this has not

significantly altered the prevailing rhythm and character resulting from the simple, consistent form and materials of these terraced dwellings.

6. The proposed additional storey would have matching materials, fenestration design and roof pitch to the existing dwelling. Nevertheless, due to the increase in height and the inclusion of a gabled roof, it would be prominently visible from both approaches along Tranmere Avenue, despite some tree screening. It would be particularly visible in views across the adjacent scout hut site, which is largely open, with only a single storey building.
7. By raising the height of the end property in an otherwise largely uniform terrace, it would unbalance the row and disrupt its consistent scale and appearance. Given the high degree of visual consistency across these types of terraced properties in the local area, the proposed additional storey would appear as a jarring and discordant feature in the streetscene. Therefore, the proposal would harm the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.
8. The GPDO allows for additional storeys to dwellings in principle, however this is subject to prior approval first being granted, including in relation to the external appearance of the dwelling. The existence of the prior approval process demonstrates that consideration is needed of the detailed design of such schemes in context and indicates the government's intention to permit such changes only where they do not result in undue harm to the surrounding area.
9. The proposal does not increase the height of the existing dwelling by the maximum permitted by the GPDO, however for the reasons set out above, the increased height would create significant visual intrusion and an unbalanced relationship with the rest of the terrace. There may be some instances where an additional storey would not result in a harmful change, depending on the circumstances of the property and its context, however this is not the case here.
10. The GPDO requires consideration to be given to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval, as if the application were a planning application. The Framework sets out that the creation of high-quality buildings is fundamental to what the planning process should achieve, and that development should be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment. I have found that the proposal would have a harmful visual impact, therefore it would not achieve these requirements.
11. Consequently, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse and would not comply with the Framework policies in relation to this prior approval matter.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred me to another terrace elsewhere in Bristol where an additional storey was allowed. However, this appears to have benefitted from planning permission rather than following the prior approval process. A planning application is a different process where other factors would have been relevant to the Council's consideration of that scheme which are not before me in this appeal. I also have very limited information about how that scheme came to be allowed, or its context.

13. No 40 has been extended to join the garage to the main dwelling, however that extension is modest in size and has not increased the height of that property. Therefore, it has not noticeably changed the street scene and has not had a comparable effect to the appeal proposal.
14. The appellant has referred to benefits of the scheme including additional living space, making efficient use of previously developed land and airspace, and contributing to the housing stock. These are not however matters I can consider in a prior approval appeal as there is no provision for any type of balancing exercise under this procedure.
15. The absence of objections is a neutral matter which does not indicate support for the proposal.
16. Accordingly, these matters do not individually or collectively justify the harm I have identified in this case.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR