



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2025

by J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/25/3367860

8 Cheyne Road, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 2DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Adrian Sayers against Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/11328/H.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single storey rear extension and front entrance porch; addition of two storey rear extension, change of roof design and addition of front entrance porch and gable.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A householder application, as defined by The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, includes an application for planning permission for development of an existing dwellinghouse. Whilst the proposed works are extensive, there is no indication that the existing dwelling would be demolished and replaced with a new dwelling. The proposed works comprise of extensions and alterations to the appeal property, most of the structure of the original dwelling would remain. Accordingly, the householder application was valid and could have been determined by the Council.

Background and Main Issue

3. The Council failed to determine the planning application within the prescribed time period and the appellant has appealed on this basis. Within its Appeal Statement the Council indicated that it would have refused planning permission and gave putative reasons for refusal which form the basis of the main issue of the appeal.
4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the effect on nearby trees.

Reasons

5. Cheyne Road accommodates dwellings of varying design, most are large, detached dwellings set within spacious grounds. Several of the dwellings appear to have been extended. The extended sections tend to be set down from the main section of the dwellings, with the eaves and ridge height much lower. In turn, this creates complex roof forms. There is little consistency to the materials used in the external finishes. However, most tend to have brown or red roof tiles. The roofing material and complex roof forms are defining features of dwellings within Cheyne

Road and nearby Stoke Paddock Road. These roads are also different in character to many of the surrounding roads, due to the presence of wide grass verges and large trees which create a verdant appearance. Given its spacious and verdant nature, the area is suburban in character.

6. The proposed roof would be finished with grey concrete tiles. Whilst new red or brown tiles would initially appear bright and contrasting, when viewed alongside the weathered tiles on neighbouring dwellings, they would assimilate over time. The proposed grey tiles would appear dark when viewed alongside neighbouring dwellings, especially once weathered. The use of these tiles would make the appeal property's roof appear discordant when viewed in the street scene. This harm would be amplified due to the importance of the roofscape.
7. The proposed front extension includes a gable end facing the road. The proposed ridge height would be set down from the ridge height of the main section of the dwelling. The eaves of the proposed extension would be higher than the eaves of the main section of the dwelling. Whilst this is similar in design to the front gables on nearby dwellings, 2, 4 and 6 Cheyne Road, the ridges on those gables are set significantly down from the ridge of the main section of those dwellings. As such, those gables appear subservient to the main dwelling. The proposed front extension would not be set significantly down from the ridge of the main section of the appeal property. It would appear as a dominant feature in the street scene, projecting from the front of the appeal property. This is contrary to the advice in the Housing Alterations and Extensions SPD¹ which indicates that successful extensions usually appear subservient to the original house and that over-large extensions can affect the visual quality of an area and street scene.
8. The proposed windows in the front elevation would have a strong vertical emphasis. Whilst many windows in neighbouring dwellings have a vertical emphasis, they are not as elongated as those proposed. Moreover, the use of floor-to-ceiling first-floor windows within front elevations is not a common feature in the area. The proposal also includes the installation of a porthole style window within the gable of the proposed front extension. Although it is a small design detail, it is not a common feature within the area and would be prominent within the front elevation. Combined the proposed fenestration of the upper floors of the front elevation would appear ill-proportioned and incongruous.
9. The appeal property could be extended under permitted development rights specified within The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. This includes the installation of windows. Nonetheless, there is no evidence before me that the appellant has sought prior approval for such an alteration or a certificate of lawfulness to confirm the extent of any such alteration. As such, this does not represent a realistic fallback position. Furthermore, my assessment is based upon the merits of the proposal before me.
10. Beyond the proposed front extension, the dwelling would be extended to the rear and to the side. The proposal also includes the creation of accommodation in the loft space. Overall, the proposal would increase the scale and massing of the appeal property. Nonetheless, the resultant development would have a similar massing to neighbouring dwellings. Similarly, the proposed height of the appeal property would be similar to its immediate neighbours. I note that the proposed

¹ Supplementary Planning Document Number 2, A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions, October 2005

extension to the rear would not appear subservient, but it would be to the rear of the dwelling and not in a prominent position. Without the proposed front extension, the proposed development, in terms of its form, scale, and massing, would appear proportionate and would assimilate with nearby dwellings. As such, these aspects of the design would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

11. Part of the roof over the main section of the dwelling would be flat, this would help create accommodation in the loft space without increasing the height of the dwelling significantly beyond the height of neighbouring dwellings. Moreover, the proposed front gabled extension would intersect the roof of the main section; this would create a complex roof form. As above, complex roof forms are a defining feature of dwellings in the area. Other than the ridge height of the gable on the front extension, the proposed roof form would not appear out of place.
12. Most of the dwellings within Cheyne Road are well set back from the road and there is a broadly consistent building line. Although the proposed front extension would project from the front of the dwelling, it would still be generally in line with the established building line. Furthermore, one of the defining features of the area is how the dwellings are set back from the road to allow large front gardens to contribute to the verdant appearance of the area. The resultant development would be well set back from the road and include a large front garden.
13. The proposal includes removing the existing tile cladding and rendering most of the walls other than the front extension, which would be finished with coarse stone. The white rendered finish would appear in keeping with others within the road and the coarse stone would provide a contrasting material to create visual interest. Likewise, the windows would be dark powder coated metal. The finish of the windows would assimilate with dark windows on other nearby dwellings.
14. During my site visit I observed that the proposed works could affect the root network of the mature Ash Tree close to the boundary with 6 Cheyne Road. The tree may have had some amenity value; however, it has been pollarded, and the appellant has confirmed it is of ill health. The proposed development would also be in proximity to many small trees and shrubs. However, due to their size and location to the rear of the dwelling they are of limited amenity value. On balance, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on mature trees with a high amenity value. Measures to protect existing trees or replace damaged trees or shrubs could be secured by condition attached to a planning permission, to ensure the proposal does not have a harmful effect on nearby trees.
15. The appellant has highlighted several examples of developments in the area which have similar characteristics to the proposed development. Notwithstanding this, most of these examples are not located on Cheyne Road or Stoke Paddock Road. For the reasons given above, the character of these roads is different to others in the area. Therefore, these highlighted developments do not set a precedent for the appeal proposal. Whilst some aspects of the proposed development are in keeping with the appearance of the area, on balance the proposal causes harm, and the alteration of the existing dwelling would not be a net benefit.
16. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area but would not have a harmful effect on nearby trees. The proposal would be contrary to Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, June 2011 (CS), and policies DM26, DM27, DM29 and

DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan, June 2014 (SADMP). These policies indicate that development should contribute positively to an area's identity and reinforce local distinctiveness, and alterations to existing buildings are expected to retain or reinstate traditional architectural features, amongst other matters. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework where it indicates that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

17. The Council also indicated that the proposal would be contrary to CS policies BCS9 and BCS11 and SADMP policies DM15 and DM17. However, as I have found that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on nearby trees, the proposal would not be contrary to these policies.

Other Matters

18. The proposal would include many environmental benefits including the installation of solar panels, the use of energy efficient glazing, improved insulation, and an upgraded heating system. There would also be economic benefits generated through the construction works. Nonetheless, the benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the identified harm.
19. I acknowledge the appellant's comments in relation to the conduct of the Council during the determination of the planning application. However, these are matters between the appellant and the Council and it is not a matter for my consideration on the acceptability of the proposed development.

Conclusion

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR