



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3366739
140 Thingwall Park, Bristol BS16 2DE

- 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 Ms Rosie Backhouse against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04700/H.
 - The development proposed is for two small roof dormers to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two small roof dormers to front elevation at 140 Thingwall Park, Bristol BS16 2DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/04700/H, with no conditions.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the planning application the subject of the appeal was determined, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework has been published (12 December 2024) and consequently amended on 7 February 2025. There has been no material change to national planning policy in respect of householder appeals, therefore I considered that it was not necessary to refer back to the parties. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace house with a pair of dormers in situ which are of a similar design to a pair constructed on 138 Thingwall Park adjacent. Whilst slightly wider than those seen next door, the render of the dormer cheeks matches that of the principal façade along with fenestration, fascias, soffits and tile detailing.
5. On the whole, the proposed dormers are relatively modest in their appearance and consequently I consider that they are not of an excessive scale or massing. Ultimately, each case must be assessed on its own merits, but bearing in mind that the pair of dormers on no138 were approved by the Council relatively recently, I find that the appeal scheme essentially comprises a logical progression of built form along the terrace at roof level.

6. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would not result in a cluttered and unbalanced roofscape that would disrupt the architectural uniformity of the property or the wider terrace, notwithstanding that the majority of front roof slopes in the locality are generally uninterrupted.
7. The Council makes reference to their Supplementary Planning Document Number 2 entitled 'A Guide for Designing House and Alterations and Extensions' (October 2005) and quotes that *"the addition to a property above ground floor level can be particularly problematic and, in most circumstances, would not be acceptable"*. However it appears to me that that text is taken from section 5.7 which relates to balconies and terraces.
8. Of more pertinence to the proposal in hand is section 5.6 concerning alterations to roofs which demonstrates a number of examples of good dormer window design. It highlights that traditional dormer windows obey recognised design rules of scale, proportions and window hierarchy, they are also subservient to the main roof by being set comfortably within the slope of the roof. Rather confusingly, it stipulates a number of essential design characteristics of acceptable dormer windows, including that they are located only on the side or rear roof pitches (first bullet point), but then the 3D illustration adjacent to it quite clearly shows an example of a subservient dormer window in the front elevation of a detached house.
9. The Council makes no specific reference to the front elevation of the dormers needing to be restricted to the glazed area and necessary construction width for dormer cheeks; it simply states that they create an overbearing presence when viewed from neighbouring dwellings and the street; also stating that the scale of the dormers, combined with their front facing position, results in an unacceptable impact on the outlook and openness of the area, but does not substantiate this further. On balance, I consider that the proposed dormers do not have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area and consequently the proposal complies with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy adopted June 2011 and Policy DM26 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies adopted July 2014 which together require new development in Bristol to deliver high quality urban design that, amongst other things, contributes positively to an area's character and identity whilst safeguarding the amenity of existing development and responding appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings and roofscapes.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. Whilst the Council has suggested conditions be imposed, due to the retrospective nature of this proposal which was complete at the time of my site visit, I consider that it is not necessary to impose any conditions upon this grant of planning permission.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR