



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2025

by **Les Greenwood MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3374015

73 Claremont Road, Bishopston, Bristol BS7 8DW

- 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 Matthew Tugwell against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/11904/H.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable loft conversion to side and rear of property and reinstatement of a bonnet roof at the front of the property where it was destroyed in World War 2.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

3. 73 Claremont Road is a handsome stone and tile 3 storey Victorian style semi-detached house, in a residential area of mainly similar properties. The proposal would extend the main roof by replacing the existing hip with a full gable and adding a box dormer structure across the resulting rear roof, with the removal of 2 chimneys. At the front, a new pitched 'bonnet' roof would be provided in place of the flat roof on top of a full height bay window feature, to match a similar roof on the other half of the pair of semis, No 71. The Council welcomes this last intervention as an improvement.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document No 2 – *A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions* advises that large, box-like dormers are inappropriate for the majority of domestic properties, with smaller dormers preferred, where these would sit comfortably within the roof slope. I take note of this guidance, but must assess the proposal within its particular context.
5. Hipped roofs predominate in the neighbourhood, with only a few gabled roofs. Quite a few of the houses have been extended with side and/or rear dormers, which mainly sit well within the original roof slopes. This proposal, in contrast, would transform the existing side and rear roofs almost completely, through bulky new build and the loss of the chimneys which are a notable feature of the local architecture. The rear dormer, though set down from the main ridge, would take up almost the full width of the rear roof and sit all the way forward to the eaves. It would therefore dominate the enlarged rear roof slope. The combination of the hip

to gable extension and the addition of the outsized rear dormer would create a bulky, box-like and unsympathetic roof structure that would sit awkwardly on top of this well detailed and proportioned building. The loss of the chimneys would further detract from the house's character.

6. I note that the dormer structure on the side of No 71 next door is a particularly large example of its kind. This does help to create scope for a roof extension to No 73. No 71 does not, however, have a box dormer at the back and retains its chimneys. The current proposal would go well beyond any re-balancing of the pair. I also note that a number of other roof alterations and extensions have taken place within the local area, but saw nothing directly comparable. The appellant refers to a hip to gable extension on the building opposite, but that is a more modern building, of a much different architectural style. I have assessed this proposal on its own merits.
7. Although the addition of the bonnet roof would be a positive aspect of the proposal, I conclude that the proposed changes to the main roof would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the building and the local area. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy, policies DM26, DM27, DM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, which aim to secure high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character and identity, with extensions being physically and visually subservient to the host building including its roof form.
8. I recognise the appellant's reasonable wish to enhance the functionality and energy efficiency of the house to help meet the needs of modern family life. This is not sufficient reason, however, to justify this particular proposal.
9. I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR