



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025

by **A O'Neill BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/25/3361147**

**Flat 4, 300 Two Mile Hill Road, St George, Bristol BS15 1AS**

- 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 Graham Smith of William Construction against the decision of Bristol City Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01000/F.
  - The development proposed is a roof extension to enlarge the loft space to facilitate additional living space.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The planning application form and appeal form did not include the appellant's full name. I have clarified that the appeal should proceed in the name shown in the banner heading above.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

### Reasons

4. 300 Two Mile Hill Road is a large property located at the corner of Two Mile Hill Road and John Street. There is a clear hierarchy to the built form of No 300 when viewed from John Street. The tallest element is located at the junction of the two roads, followed by a two storey rear extension and then a single storey element which is the subject of this appeal. The appeal property appears as a subservient extension to the main building.
5. The reduction in building height along John Street provides a gradual transition from the taller built form at the junction with Two Mile Hill Road to the row of two storey terraced properties which are located to the other side of the appeal property fronting John Street.
6. This building form is reflected on the opposite side of John Street to the appeal site. Numbers 2a and 2b John Street are accommodated in a single storey building which is located to the rear of number 302 Two Mile Hill Road and which has a similar scale and mass to the appeal property. To the other side of number 2a is a row of two storey terraced properties reflecting those adjacent to the appeal site. The

general symmetry in building form on each side of the road contributes to the distinctive street scene and character of John Street.

7. The ridge of the extended appeal property would remain lower than the adjoining part of No 300, however there would be a minimal difference in their overall heights. The additional vertical mass to the appeal property would be out of proportion with the host building and would erode the hierarchy of its built form. It would no longer be visually and physically subservient to the adjoining two storey element, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
8. The increased height would also erode the gradual transition in building height along John Street. Combined with its prominent position forward of the building line of the adjacent terraced properties, the extended appeal property would appear unacceptably dominant in the street scene. Moreover, its altered proportions would interrupt the symmetry in the built form along John Street, causing harm to its locally distinctive character.
9. Finally, in the absence of any other front dormer windows visible in the vicinity of the appeal site, the three proposed would appear as incongruous and alien additions to the street scene, which would not be minimised by their scale or design.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such it would conflict with policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014). Together these policies require development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity and reinforce local distinctiveness, responding appropriately to the proportion of existing buildings. They also require extensions to respect the scale, proportions and overall design and character of the host building and broader street scene and be physically and visually subservient to the host building.

### **Other Matters**

11. My attention has been drawn to the rent crisis declared by Bristol City Council. However, the creation of two additional bedspaces would make a limited contribution to the City's supply of housing. The support that construction and future occupancy would provide to construction employment and the local economy would also be limited. As such, these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
12. I understand that the appeal proposal is a revised scheme in comparison to a previous proposal, which was refused for reasons including insufficient living space. Whilst the current proposal would provide appropriate living conditions, this does not outweigh the harm I have found in relation to the main issue of this appeal.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*A O'Neill*

INSPECTOR