



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3367932

117 Henbury Road, Henbury, Bristol BS10 7AA

- 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 Ian Dorrington against the decision of Bristol City Council
 - The application Ref. is 23/02777/H.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the front and rear of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for an extension to the front and rear of the dwelling at 117 Henbury Road, Henbury, Bristol in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 23/02777/H, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. S01; S02; S03; S04; S05; S06; S07; S08; S09 & S10 and as further explained and illustrated in the Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement dated January 2024;
 - 3) The development shall not be carried out other than in full accordance with Section 5: 'Arboricultural Method Statement' of the Arboricultural Report: Impact Assessment and Method Statement dated 12 June 2025 (Ref. WTC_1533.01) prepared by the Wotton Tree Consultancy.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Henbury Conservation Area, and (ii) the effect on a protected mature cedar tree.

Reasons

Conservation Area

3. On this issue, the Officer's Report argues that all aspects of the size and design of the proposed front extension together with the choice of materials would be incongruous, unduly prominent, and out of keeping with the host dwelling. Included in this criticism is firstly that, unlike other front porches in the area that are stepped back from the principal elevation and remain subservient, the appeal scheme would be overbearing. Secondly, examples of architectural features that are in keeping

with the conservation area include *‘brick detailing, prominent gables, steep hipped roofs, diamond-shaped leaded casement windows, and recessed front porches.....’* and these do not feature as elements of the proposed development.

4. However, in my view the Council’s analysis is flawed on two main counts, both of which the appellant’s appeal statement refer to in some detail. Firstly, there is the diversity of built form in Henbury Road including as regards architectural style and materials, orientation of properties and their settings, the latter including detached properties in good sized gardens set back and well screened from the road. The appeal dwelling and its immediate context, including other such buildings together with the contrasting adjacent flat conversion and extension of Chesterfield House, are illustrative of that diversity which also embraces the wider character of Henbury Road.
5. Secondly, No. 117 itself is a bespoke 1960s building of the modernist architectural style and as such, if enlarged, requires a consistency of design and materials with that concept rather than a contrived application of the architectural features cited in the Officer’s Report and referred to in paragraph 3 above. It is on this basis that I consider the alterations and additions proposed for the east elevation and shown in Drawing No. S09 are appropriate for the upgrade of the building and extension of the floorspace.
6. The extension to the porch would essentially line in with the existing garage and then be set back 500mm for the extended kitchen. The combined additional floor area is modest, and the extension’s presence would prevent the eye being drawn to the garage and the essentially featureless main gable with a perception as being overly prominent in the principal elevation as seen from the road.
7. Indeed, the visual relief that the front extension would provide from the extensive area of render would noticeably significantly improve the character and appearance of the building through its more contemporary and coherent design. This improvement is seen clearly in the comparative drawings of the existing and proposed front elevation views on page 8 of the Design and Access Statement. Finally, the extended frontage would remain well set back from Henbury Road and be seen in the context of the mature cedar tree and front boundary planting. Accordingly, I have no reservations with the principle, size, design, and choice of external materials for the front extension.
8. On this issue, because of the improvement in the appearance of the host dwelling, I conclude that the appeal scheme, including the front porch extension, would as a minimum preserve the character and appearance of the Henbury Conservation Area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies BCS21 & BCS22 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 (‘the CS’); Policies DM26, DM27, DM30 & DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 (‘the Local Plan’), or with Government policy in Sections 12 & 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024 (‘the Framework’).

Protected Tree

9. Turning to the second main issue, the Council was correct to refuse permission because of an absence of information as regards the effect of the proposed development on a mature cedar tree close to the front extension and protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

10. However, this matter has now been addressed by the submission of an Arboricultural Report: Impact Assessment and Method Statement as an appeal document. I have carefully considered this report and am satisfied that a condition requiring full compliance with the Method Statement will ensure that the proposed development would not adversely affect the short and long term health of the mature cedar tree.
11. For these reasons I am satisfied that as regards this issue there would be no breach of CS Policies BCS9, BCS11 & BCS21; Local Plan Policies DM15, DM17, DM26, DM27 & DM29, or with paragraph 136 of the Framework.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the reasons explained above, I find that the appeal scheme would at least preserve the character and appearance of the Henbury Conservation Area and thereby its significance as a designated heritage asset. In addition, the development would cause no harm to the protected mature cedar tree. I shall therefore allow the appeal.
13. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning.
14. To safeguard the mature cedar tree, a condition is also required stipulating that the development will be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. In paragraph 5.2.1 the report includes the commitment that tree works will be undertaken before commencement of other site operations and thereby has the approval, albeit tacit, of the appellant in this respect. This thereby complies with the Town and Country Planning (Pre-Commencement Conditions) Regulations) 2018.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR