



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by **N Perrins MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/25/3372648
25 Hill Street, St George, Bristol BS5 7QN

- 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 Mr Daniel Munroe against Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/12058/F.
 - The application sought planning permission for construction of a two-storey side extension to facilitate conversion of 1 dwelling to form 2 new dwellings and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a two-storey side extension to facilitate conversion of 1 dwelling to form 2 new dwellings and associated works at 25 Hill Street, St George, Bristol BS5 7QN, in accordance with the terms of the application and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (i) Location Plan Drawing No: 23/002 Sheet 01, (ii) Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing No: 23/002 Sheet 03, (iii) Proposed Cycle Store & Bin Store Details Drawing No: 23/002 Sheet 04, and (iv) Existing and Proposed Streetscenes Drawing No: 23/002 Sheet 05.
 - 3) The development shall not be occupied until the measures detailed in the energy strategy (prepared by Fenton Energy dated 12 December 2023) have been fully installed. Verification of the proposed measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby approved.
 - 4) The development shall not be occupied until the bicycle and bin storage areas as shown on the approved plans have been installed and thereafter retained.
 - 5) Prior to the occupation of the development, or it being taken into beneficial use, a signed statement or declaration prepared by a suitably competent person confirming that the site is, or has been made, safe and stable for the approved development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This document shall confirm the methods and findings of the intrusive site investigations and the completion of any remedial works and / or mitigation necessary to address the risks posed by past coal mining activity. The intrusive

site investigations and remedial works shall be carried out in accordance with authoritative UK guidance.

Main Issue

2. The appeal is made against the failure of the Council to determine the application within the statutory period. The Council has not provided a statement or any subsequent indication of what decision it would have made if it had determined the planning application within the prescribed period. Consequently, the main issue is whether there are any planning policies, planning issues and / or matters raised in the representations that would justify refusal of the proposal. I have considered the main issues raised in the information before me under the headings below.

Reasons

Principle of development

3. The application site is a semi-detached property located on the northern side of Hill Street, which is in the urban area of the city. The property has been extended in the past with a two-storey side extension that has a garage at ground floor. The character of the road is residential comprising a mix of semi-detached dwellings and terraces of dwellings. The appeal property is at the end of the run of dwellings on the northern side of Hill Street. Adjacent to the appeal site to the east are the rear gardens of properties that front onto Whiteway Road.
4. The proposal seeks to erect a further two storey side extension at the site to create a new 2-bedroom dwelling. The existing two storey side extension would be converted to facilitate the proposed development with the existing garage for the property removed and replaced with access to the proposed new dwelling. The appeal site would be sub-divided with both the new property and the one retained having street frontage and rear gardens.
5. Policy BC5 of the Bristol Core Strategy 2011 (BCS) seeks to deliver 30,600 new homes in the city by 2026. The policy confirms that the development of new homes will primarily be on previously developed sites across the city. Policy BC5 also identifies that 4,200 homes of the requirement will be met through small unidentified sites across the city. Policy BCS20 of the BCS states that new development will maximise opportunities to re-use previously developed land. Policy BCS20 requires that the appropriate density for any individual site will be informed by the characteristics of the site, the local context, accessibility, opportunities for a mix of uses and types of housing and the need to achieve high quality and well-designed environments.
6. The site is previous developed land located in a residential area. The site is only large enough to accommodate one dwelling and as such is an appropriate density that reflects the street and surrounding area, which is made up entirely of semi-detached and terraced properties. The proposal to create a terrace is also consistent with the types of dwellings that form part of the character and typology on Hill Street. I will cover matters of detailed design in the next section but in terms of its location, density and pattern of development on Hill Street, the proposed development is acceptable in principle and consistent with the requirements of Policies BCS5 and BCS20 of the BCS.

Character and appearance

7. Policy BCS20 of the BCS requires new development to deliver high-quality, well-designed environments. Policy BCS21 of the BCS states that new development should deliver high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character by reinforcing local distinctiveness.
8. Policy DM21 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2014 (SADMP) allows for the loss of gardens where the proposal would represent a more efficient use of land at a location where higher densities are appropriate. Policy DM26 of the SADMP requires development to reflect local architectural styles, rhythms, proportions and detailing of surrounding buildings. Policy DM27 of the SADMP requires layout and form to make efficient use of land and contribute to the creation of quality urban design. Policy DM30 of the SADMP requires alterations to existing buildings to respect the siting, scale, form, proportions materials and details of the overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.
9. The proposed extended building would largely replicate the existing appearance and form, including half hipped roof, of the host property. The proposal would include a bay window, which reflects a design feature, including on the host property, of many of the houses along the road. The new front door, to be created where the existing garage door is, would be set within an arched entrance to match the same style used on the host property. The windows would also reflect the pattern and type used on the host property. In terms of layout, the extended part would respect the prevailing building line along the road. The roof ridge height would also be maintained. The materials proposed would match those used on the host property to ensure the extended part would appear as a harmonious and inconspicuous addition in terms of its detailing.
10. Therefore, while the proposal will extend the pair of semi-detached properties to one side and create a short terrace of dwellings, for the reasons stated it would not appear as an integrated and well-designed addition to the host property. I also note that short terraces of dwellings are not uncommon in the area, which further confirms to me that the form and appearance of the proposal would assimilate successfully with the character of the area.
11. While the garden area for the host property would be reduced to facilitate the proposed development, it would not result in a garden size that is out of character with those that prevail in the area as evidenced by the plots shown on the submitted location plan. Similarly, the proposed garden for the new dwelling would reflect the size of gardens in the area. This is, therefore, a location where a higher density of development can be achieved without causing any material harm to the layout and pattern of development in the area.
12. For the reasons stated, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies BCS20 and BCS21 of the BCS and Policies DM21, DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the SADMP.

Living conditions

13. The proposed development would extend the existing property by around 3 metres into the space currently occupied by parking. While there would be a small gap retained, the proposal would be sited close to the common boundary with the rear

of properties Nos 51-55 Whiteway Road. The properties on Whiteway Road have a stepped layout and are staggered away from the appeal site as the terrace extends north-eastwards. I acknowledge that objections were raised from No 53 regarding potential loss of privacy, natural light, overshadowing, and overbearing impacts to their property.

14. In terms of privacy, the extended flank wall would not include any windows and would, therefore, not result in overlooking to the rear gardens and elevations of Nos 51, 53 and 55 Whiteway Road. As such, there would not be any adverse privacy impacts to these properties.
15. Regarding natural light and overshadowing, there will be a gap of about 13 metres between the proposed building and the rear windows of No. 53, which is not an uncommon distance between side and rear elevations in urban areas like this one. Therefore, even though the new wall would be closer to the shared boundary, the separation distance is sufficient to prevent any significant loss of light or increased overshadowing for No. 53's rear windows. Additionally, since No. 53 is southeast of the site and already shaded by No. 51's side wall, the proposal is unlikely to cause any material further reduction in daylight or sunlight because of where the sun travels and how the properties on Whiteway Road are positioned in relation to the appeal site.
16. Similarly, while the separation gap would be smaller to No 51, there are no windows in its rear elevation and consequently no adverse natural light or overshadowing to that dwelling would arise. There would also be no material loss of natural light or overshadowing to No 55 due to the distance from the appeal site arising from the stepped layout along Whiteway Road.
17. Regarding whether the proposal would be overbearing, the existing arrangement already has a blank flank wall facing towards the rear of neighbouring properties on Whiteway Road. While it would be brought closer to the shared boundary the view and overall impact would remain similar to existing. As such, I do not find that the proposal would be unacceptably overbearing to the neighbouring properties when considering the separation distances that would remain, the use of a hipped roof that would help to minimise the perception of scale and the current views of the flank wall that exist.
18. In terms of future occupiers of the property, the proposed dwelling would have an internal floorspace of 78 square metres, which meets the Nationally Described Space Standards for a 3-person home. The proposal also includes a rear garden for outdoor amenity space of a size that meets the Council's space requirements set out in the Council's Urban Living Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). For these reasons, the proposed development would provide an acceptable living environment for future occupiers of the appeal proposal.
19. In conclusion, the proposal would not result in a materially adverse impact on neighbouring living conditions. The proposal would also provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers of the proposal. For these reasons, the appeal proposal complies with the amenity requirements set out in Policies BCS18 and BCS21 of the BCS, and Policies DM27, DM29 and DM30 of the SADMP.

Highways and parking

20. Appendix 2 of the SADMP requires 1.25 car parking spaces for a two-bedroom dwelling. These, however, are identified as being maximum standards rather than minimums. Appendix 2 also states that these standards will be applied flexibly to small scale development to allow for the best layout of the site.
21. No dedicated off-street parking is proposed. Instead, the appellant seeks to rely upon the accessibility of the location that is close to bus stops and provision of cycle storage. Hill Street and the nearby roads are also not subject to any on-street parking restrictions. While I note objections were submitted regarding parking pressure in the locality, I observed on my site inspection that took place during the middle of the day that there were several spaces to park vehicles on Hill Street as well as on surrounding roads. I have no reason to believe that the parking conditions I observed were untypical. I, therefore, conclude that there would be capacity for the local road network to accommodate vehicular parking demands from the development without resulting in a severe impact to the local highway network.
22. Appendix 2 requires two secure cycle spaces for a two-bed dwelling. These would be provided by a dedicated secure cycle store location in the rear garden for both the proposed and retained dwellings. Access to the cycle store would be through each property. There is no evidence before me, or policy provision, that indicates this would be an unacceptable arrangement for cycle provision for terraced properties.
23. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable in highway and parking terms and accords with Policy BCS10 of the BCS and Policy DM23 of the SADMP, which require development to be located where sustainable transport patterns can be achieved and provide an appropriate level of safe, secure, accessible and usable parking provision having regard to parking standards.

Waste provision

24. Bin storage would be at the front of the new dwelling. This is an acceptable arrangement for the collection and storage of waste servicing in accordance with the requirements of Policy DM32 of the SADMP.

Renewable Energy and Sustainability

25. The application was supported by a Sustainability Statement and Energy Strategy, which sets out that the proposal would include an air source heat pump and photovoltaic panels, which together would reduce carbon emissions from the development to around 18%. While this is lower than the 20% required by Policy BCS14 of the BCS, I am satisfied the residual can be made up by the proposal not incorporating car parking and requiring future occupants to be more reliant on sustainable transport than if the proposal had included parking provision. As such the information provided demonstrates the proposal would be acceptable in its contribution to addressing climate change in compliance with Policies BCS13 and BCS14 of the BCS.

Biodiversity

26. The proposal has been submitted as a self-build dwelling on a site that is less than 0.5 hectares in size. Based on this information, I am satisfied that the proposal

qualifies as being exempt from providing the statutory requirement for biodiversity net gain and would not require the approval of a biodiversity net gain plan before development is begun.

Ground Conditions

27. I understand from the information before me that the site falls within an area defined by the Coal Authority as a Development High Risk Area where there is recorded coal mining features at surface or shallow depths. The application is supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, which presents a credible overview of coal mining information relevant the site. The Coal Authority has reviewed this report and while agrees with its general content and recommendations, advises that a condition is attached to ensure a suitably competent person confirms the site is, or has been made, safe and stable for the proposed development before it is occupied. In view of the site's location in a high-risk area with former mining works, I agree this condition is necessary to ensure a safe and secure development takes place cognisant on its ground conditions. This would ensure the proposal complies with the requirements of Policy DM37 of the SADMP relating to unstable land.

Conditions

28. I have considered the need for conditions having regard to paragraph 57 of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I consider it is necessary to include the standard time limit for implementation and a condition listing the plans for reasons of clarity over what has been approved. I do not need to include a condition specifically relating to materials as these details are included on the approved plans. I also include a condition to ensure that the proposed renewable energy measures, cycle and bin storage are installed prior to the occupation of development. These are necessary to ensure that the proposal includes suitable measures to minimise the effects of climate change, promote the use of sustainable transport to serve the proposed development in lieu of off-street vehicular parking and includes suitable waste servicing arrangements.
29. I have also included the condition recommended by the Coal Authority as conclude based on the information before me it is reasonable and necessary to ensure a safe development takes place at the site.

Conclusion

30. For the reasons given and considering all matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development with conditions accords with the development plan and the appeal is allowed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR