



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2026

By G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/25/3374822

17 Chestnut Walk, Bishopsworth, Bristol, BS13 7RJ

- 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 M Thomas against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/13519/H.
 - The development proposed is a dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a dormer loft conversion at 17 Chestnut Walk, Bishopsworth, Bristol, BS13 7RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/13519/H, subject to the conditions set out in the accompanying Schedule.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

2. The appeal property lies within the Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area (CA). The Council has confirmed that no Conservation Area Appraisal has been produced since its designation.
3. Amendments to the scheme were submitted during the course of the Council's consideration of the proposal. Since the appeal's submission the Council has confirmed the identity of the plan subject of the determination, and to avoid confusion, has submitted a copy of that plan. I shall proceed on this basis.

Main Issue

4. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and its surroundings including whether the character or appearance of the Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area (CA) would be preserved or enhanced.

Reasons

5. Judging from the map provided the CA has an elongated form. It incorporates several open areas including Highridge Common and Manor Wood, but also encapsulates extensive residential areas. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling contained within a quiet cul-de-sac which itself forms part of a wider residential area displaying distinct suburban characteristics.
6. The properties within the cul-de-sac are similarly designed but did not strike me as being of particular architectural merit, being comprised of rendered walls with pantile roofs, with some of the original red tiles having been replaced. Solar panels

and rooflights have been inserted on some of the roofs at the front. Most dwellings have single storey extensions, garages or other structures to their sides.

7. The proposal involves the erection of a box-like dormer which would occupy most of the rear roof plane, albeit below the ridge. Structures of this type are not uncommon locally, indeed two appear on the roofs of a neighbouring pair at Nos 9 & 11. I saw that these were not intrusive in the street, with their side profiles alone being evident in gaps between buildings. They did not disfigure the dwellings upon which they had been added when viewed from the street.
8. The Council consider that the installed dormers should not be regarded as a precedent for similar development. This is on the basis that the dormer on No 11 was erected without permission, and that planning permission was granted¹ at No 9 ‘..with reference to matching number 11’s neighbouring roof extension as they are a semi-detached pair.’
9. I note the Council’s rationale. However, the officer report on the proposal affecting No 9 says:

The Authority is required (under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

The design is considered to be suitable, and not out of character with the property or the surrounding area. The proposed alterations to the host building would have a negligible impact upon the character, appearance and historic significance of the surrounding Conservation Area. The integrity and status of adjacent heritage assets would therefore be preserved by the proposed development.

The proposed development would match the existing neighbouring roof extension and as it would be sited to the rear and will be in a position that is not visible thus will not have a visual impact on Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area.

10. The Council determined that application having regard to the same development plan policies and local guidance applicable now. The fact that a matching dormer occupied the neighbouring roof was but one element considered in the equation.
11. To my mind, whilst the dormer subject of appeal would be evident at the rear of the property from gardens, it would have no greater effect on the public realm than that at No 9, which the Council recently found to be acceptable. The impact and effect on the CA would be negligible, and the character and appearance of the CA would thus be preserved.
12. The Council says that the dormer would be visible from the public realm on the adjacent Headley Road. I assessed the proposal from that street and found that for most of its length, the proposed dormer would be masked by extant development. It could be glimpsed through a narrow gap between buildings, but even so, it would be barely noticeable and would not draw the eye.
13. In conclusion, I find the proposal to be of a suitable design for its context, in accord with those provisions of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) Policy BCS21 and the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (LP) Policy DM26 & DM27 directed to achieving good quality urban design contributing positively to local character and distinctiveness. No

¹ Under Ref 18/03326/H

conflict arises with CS policy BSC22 and LP policy DM31 requiring development proposals to safeguard the setting of heritage assets and to preserve or enhance their character and appearance.

Conditions

14. It is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, and a condition to this effect is therefore imposed in the interests of certainty. A condition in respect of materials is imposed in the interests of visual amenity.

Other matters

15. Reference has been made to other development plan policies but those to which I have referred to appear to me to be the most relevant. I have also taken account of the various references to the Framework². Although not decisive in my considerations I note that no objections were raised by any local resident following consultation.
16. I note the Council's concern regarding precedent but as required I have considered this proposal on its merits and found the scheme to be unobjectionable. No other matter raised is of such weight or significance as to outweigh those considerations leading me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: The location plan and Drawings Ref PLN1-Rev2 received by the Council on 14 October 2025.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

² The National Planning Policy Framework