



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 02 January 2026

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3375998

22 Brecon Road, Henleaze, Bristol BS9 4DS

- 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 Lesley Barakchizadeh against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/13258/H.
 - The development proposed is replacement of single storey garage with two storey garage extension, new single storey rear extension, remodelling of house with two new 2 storey bay windows, new porch canopy, new windows, render and roof tiles throughout. New terrace and deck to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The name on the appeal form differs from that on the application form. It has been confirmed that the name on the appeal form is correct. This is reflected in the banner heading above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

-the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area including the setting of the designated heritage assets the Downs Conservation Area and the listed building known as St Ursula's High School; and

-the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring property 1 Brecon Close with particular regard to light levels, outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. 22 Brecon Road is a large, detached dwelling with a gable projection which mirrors neighbouring property 21 Brecon Road in form and design. The dwelling is set within a street scene which comprises dwellings of varying designs and scales which are set back from the road and occupy large plots. This, in combination with planting in front gardens, results in a varied, pleasant and verdant street scene, to which the appeal site makes a positive contribution.
5. The site is located close to the boundary of the Downs Conservation Area (CA) which covers an extensive area centred around Clifton Downs, an expansive plateau of open parkland. The CA boundary runs along the eastern boundary of St

Ursula's High School, which is located to the west of the site. The significance of the CA is principally derived from the quality of the landscaped parkland, the rural character of the Downs, and their contrast with the sublime character of the Gorge and its escarpments. Given the siting of intervening development there is limited intervisibility in street scene views between the site and the CA and the appeal property does not appear to contribute to the setting or significance of the CA.

6. To the west of the site is St Ursula's High School, a grade II listed mid-19th century mid-Georgian style house in use as a school. The significance of this building appears to lie in the historic and architectural interest of its built fabric and the contribution the appearance of the building makes to the wider streetscape. The site does not appear to have any historic connection to the listed building, and it does not appear to derive its significance from any physical connection to the appeal site. Views of parts of the listed building, including an attractive 3-storey tower, are gained from the street scene in the gap between the appeal property and 1 Brecon Close. Whilst there are other views of this tower within the street scene, including some in which the whole tower can be seen, nonetheless, these views between the appeal property and 1 Brecon Close make a pleasant contribution to the street scene and enable aspects of the listed building's significance to be appreciated.
7. The proposal is for the erection of a 2-storey side extension following the demolition of the existing garage incorporating a roof terrace within the rear part of the extension. To the rear a single storey flat roof extension and a deck are proposed. The side extension would have a reduced width in comparison to the existing garage, and the palette of materials and use of projecting gables would be consistent with properties in the surrounding area. It is stated that the proposal would result in the removal of an overhanging gutter and mismatched renders. Nonetheless, by virtue of the extension's height and massing, its lack of setback and minimal set down, the extension would wholly dominate the host dwelling. The resultant width of the dwelling and proximity to the site boundaries would result in a dwelling which appears excessive in width in relation to the size of the plot, giving the development a somewhat cramped and contrived appearance. The extension would result in the erosion of the form and proportions of the host building so that it would bear little resemblance to the existing building and would no longer be read as a mirrored pair with the adjacent property, harmfully disrupting the symmetry which is appreciable in street scene views. The excessive scale would be clearly apparent from the public realm, harmfully detracting from the contribution the property makes to the established character of the area.
8. As the site is located close to the CA and St Ursula's High School, a grade II listed building, I have had special regard to section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which requires that decision makers pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, and Section 66(1) of the same act which requires that, when considering planning proposals, decision makers should have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings.
9. Given the limited intervisibility between the site and the CA the proposal would not result in a change to the way in which the CA is experienced and would not harm the setting of the CA or its significance. Based on the evidence before me, the 4-storey campanile tower, which forms part of the grade II listed building known as St Ursula's High School, and which is referenced by the Council in the reason for

refusal, is located within another part of the building complex and there is no intervisibility between the campanile tower and the appeal site. Nonetheless, the extension would obscure parts of the listed building, in particular an attractive 3-storey tower. Whilst views of this part of the listed building, and thus the ability to appreciate its significance, appear to have been altered by intervening development, including at Brecon Close¹, and whilst this tower is not specifically referenced in the listing, it is nonetheless an attractive part of the building which positively contributes to the listed building's significance. The obscured views resulting from the development would cause harm to its setting and how the building is experienced, including the ability to understand the significance of the building. The harm would be less than substantial but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.

10. Under such circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There would be some economic benefits during construction. However, there is little substantive evidence that this, or the primarily private benefits of the provision of improved living accommodation for the appellant, would be sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Conflict therefore arises with the historic environment protection policies in the Framework.
11. In support of the proposal the appellant has referenced planning permissions² for extensions which, it is stated, are similar in scale and form to the appeal proposal. However, based on the information before me there is no compelling evidence that these extensions resulted in dwellings which were excessive in scale in relation to the size of the plot, harmfully disrupted the symmetry of a mirrored pair which contributed positively to the character of the area or resulted in harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. Given this, these permissions do not appear to be directly comparable to the proposal. I afford them limited weight.
12. Whilst I have found that no harm would arise to the setting and significance of the CA, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and harm to the setting of a listed building. It would therefore conflict with those aims of policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and policies DM26, DM27, DM28, DM30 and DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) (DMP) which require that development deliver high quality urban design which contributes towards local character and distinctiveness and which safeguards or enhances heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including historic buildings and which set out that extensions and alterations to existing buildings will be expected to respect the siting, scale, form, proportions, materials, details and the overall design and character of the host building. I also find conflict with the Framework which requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
13. Conflict also arises with The Supplementary Planning Document 2- A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005) (SPD) which states that as a starting point for any alterations or extension the original appearance of the property should be considered and any changes designed to reflect the character and style of the original house and that of the local area. It also advises that over-

¹ Approved under application 1267F/97N

² 22/04731/H, 95/02803/H, 18/01798/H, 16/04135/H, 21/02260/H, 25/012235/H, 22/01552/H, 16/06206/H, 16/03368/H, 24/04745/H

large extensions can affect the visual quality of an area and the street scene, as well as unbalance the appearance of the existing building.

Living conditions

14. The proposal includes a first-floor terrace to the rear which would incorporate a solid wall to the side and a glass balustrade to the rear. This terrace is located close to the site boundary with No 1, resulting in potential opportunities for overlooking from the terrace over the balustrade. Nonetheless, this overlooking would be no greater than that which currently occurs from the host property's first-floor rear window and would have outlook over 2 garages. Additionally, I note that the proposal would result in the removal of an existing first-floor side-facing window. The proposal is supported by an analysis of overshadowing which indicates that overshadowing of the rear garden to No 1 would be minimal.
15. The extension would be pulled in from the site boundary at its southwest corner and would reduce in height towards the rear. Nonetheless, the increase in the height of the building would result in a significant increase in its scale and bulk which, given its proximity to the boundary, would appear overbearing in views from No 1 and its garden, resulting in a loss of outlook to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupants of this property. Even if it is the case that the development at Brecon Close³ resulted in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property, this would not in itself justify development elsewhere which is harmful to living conditions.
16. The proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Brecon Close through loss of outlook. Conflict therefore arises with those aims of CS policy BCS21 and DMP policy DM30 which require that development safeguard the amenity of existing development. I also find conflict with the SPD which has similar aims.

Other Matters

17. The appellant's dissatisfaction with the handling of the planning application is noted. However, this is not a matter for consideration in this appeal which focusses on the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR

³ Approved under application 1267F/97N