



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by **N Perrins MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/25/3363145

26 Camberley Road, Knowle, Bristol BS4 1SZ

- 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 Francisco Mercedes against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00792/F.
 - The proposed development is to demolish existing bungalow and replace with two 3-bed dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions for occupants of adjacent dwellings and future occupants of the development;
 - Whether the development would provide an appropriate response to climate change; and
 - Whether the development would be appropriately serviced in relation to cycle and waste storage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site consists of one bungalow in a pair of semi-detached bungalows, situated on an irregular, kite-shaped plot. The site is accessible only by a pedestrian footway, with no vehicular access available. The surrounding area is residential comprising mainly features semi-detached and terraced properties.
4. The proposed development involves demolishing the existing property and constructing a semi-detached pair of three-bedroom dwellings, each with a private garden. The buildings will appear as three storeys in scale due to the inclusion of rooms in the roof space, featuring dormer windows. Additionally, the new structure will be connected to the adjacent dwelling at No 26a.

5. Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy 2011 (BCS) sets out that new development should deliver high quality urban design that will be expected amongst other matters to contribute positively to an area's character and identity.
6. The proposed development, featuring rooms within the roof space, would create a building noticeably taller than the adjacent dwellings, which comprise one and two-storey properties. The increased scale of the development compared to the existing dwelling would be unduly prominent within the section of the Camberley Road streetscape where the site is located. The excessive height would appear especially discordant and fragmented in relation to the adjacent single-storey bungalow that would remain attached to the development. Consequently, the proposed pair of dwellings at the height proposed would appear incongruous within the street scene that would harm the character of the area.
7. Furthermore, the pitched roof design with dormer windows would present a distinct contrast to the adjacent two-storey dwellings, which feature mono-pitched roofs. The combination of an unusually tall building for its location and a noticeably different roof form would create a development that would not integrate successfully with the area's established character, appearance, and identity.
8. The proposed layout is only able to provide a small garden for the dwelling on the northern side of the plot. This garden would be markedly smaller than what is typical in the area, where properties generally feature gardens proportionate to their built footprints. Combined with the development's considerable height, the layout would result in a cramped form of development that inconsistent with the established and generally uniform pattern of development in the locality.
9. To conclude, the proposed development would not assimilate successfully with the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy BCS21 of the BCS and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 (SADMP), which require development to deliver high quality design, contribute positively to an area's character and identity reinforcing local distinctiveness, responding appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape form and proportion of existing buildings and roofscapes and incorporate high quality detail that contributes positively to the overall design approach of the building. The development also does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) for development to be sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

10. While the building would be set further back into the plot compared to the existing building line, there would be only approximately 6 metres between the proposed dwellings and those opposite at Nos. 24a and 24. At this distance, the scale and height of the development would create an environment that would be unduly oppressive and intrusive through mutual overlooking between future occupants of the proposed development and those opposite.
11. The Council has also identified that the proposed building would intercept the 25-degree line taken from the centre of ground floor windows opposite the site, which would result in a harmful loss of light to Nos 24 and 24a. The 25-degree line test is an accepted industry method for evaluating the impact on daylight and sunlight between buildings facing one another. While the appellant submitted an assessment using a 45-degree line test, this approach is generally used for

assessing adjacent buildings and not those opposite to each other as would be the case for the appeal scheme. While it is acknowledged that similar distances exist between the current mono-pitched properties, they have a lower overall height and, therefore, not directly comparable to the identified impacts in this case. In the absence of any evidence to demonstrate otherwise, such as a Daylight or Sunlight assessment, I find that the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to the ground floor windows at Nos 24 and 24a.

12. In terms of outdoor amenity space, the garden for the dwelling furthest north in the plot would be small and awkwardly shaped. This would not provide future occupants with a sufficient quality of amenity space or outlook and would negatively affect their living conditions.
13. For the reasons set out, the proposed development would result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties and future occupants of the development. This is contrary to Policies BCS18 and BCS21 of the BCS and Policy DM29 of the SADMP and guidance in the Council's Guide of Designing House Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2005), all of which require development to provide sufficient space for everyday activities, safeguard the amenity of existing development and create a high quality environment for future occupiers and achieve appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight. The proposal is also contrary to Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which requires development to achieve a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Climate Change

14. Policy BCS14 of the BCS sets out specific requirements for development to provide at least 20% carbon emissions reduction from residual energy use. The policy also expects development to demonstrate how its heating systems comply with a six-step approach to achieve the lowest feasible carbon solution.
15. The appellant has provided an Energy Statement with supporting table and calculations. The plans also show inclusion of PV panels on the roof. From this, the information indicates that the required 20% reduction in carbon emissions would be achieved from the PV panels. However, the information does not confirm that the proposed heating system is the lowest feasible carbon solution with references made to both use of heat pumps as well as electricity. Whilst I would expect this issue can be addressed through further information, this is not before me to consider as part of the appeal.
16. Accordingly, and based on the information before me, I find that the proposal does not adequately demonstrate that the proposed heating system accords with the requirements of Policies BCS13, BCS14, and BCS15, which require developments to maximise energy efficiency, including arriving at the lowest carbon solution feasible for heating properties.

Cycle parking and waste storage

17. The appellant has stated that the requirements for cycle and waste storage could have been addressed by revised plans, had they been notified of these matters during the planning application process. While it is acknowledged that amending the plans in this respect might be feasible, this information is not before me as part of this appeal. In the absence of such further details, I find that the proposal does

not accord with Policy BCS10 of the BCS, nor with Policies DM23 and DM32 of the SADMP in terms of cycle and waste provision.

Other Matters

18. Objections have raised concerns over the impact on parking conditions in the area and construction disruption. Whilst not a reason for refusal, the Highway Authority advised that a parking stress survey should be carried out to consider whether the proposal would result in unsafe parking in nearby roads. In view of the appeal site not having off-street parking, I agree that this should be carried out before any planning permission is granted for the proposed development. I am, however, satisfied that any construction impacts could be mitigated for through a construction management plan, and it is a neutral matter in this appeal.
19. The appellant has expressed concerns regarding engagement levels during the planning application process, as well as the performance of the Council's planning service, which has previously been subject to special measures. While these issues may understandably cause frustration for customers, the level of contact and service provided in this case are neutral factors and do not influence my assessment of the proposal, which is based solely on its planning merits.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

20. The Council has confirmed in its submissions that it is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing at the present time. In these circumstances, the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Paragraph 11 (d) is engaged, which requires any adverse impacts of granting planning permission to be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the benefits, when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole.
21. I have identified that the proposal would not accord with several policies in the development plan, by not presenting good quality design that would assimilate with local character, provide suitable living conditions, or include suitable measures for mitigating climate change, cycle and waste storage. These policies are consistent with the related policy provisions set out in the Framework. I give significant weight to the conflict with the Framework's policies in this regard.
22. In terms of benefits, the proposal would provide an additional dwelling on a previously developed small site, in a context where there is a housing land supply deficit, all of which is consistent with policies in the Framework. However, the benefits from one dwelling would be limited, due to the small contribution that the development would have in addressing the Council's housing supply deficit.
23. Accordingly, the benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm I have identified from the proposal, in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of existing and future occupants, and lack of clarity on climate change mitigation, cycle and waste measures. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.
24. For the reasons given, I dismiss the appeal.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR