
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2017

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 06 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/W/16/3162137
12 Corfe Crescent, Keynsham BS31 1AQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Vytaute Germanaite against the decision of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03742/FUL, dated 26 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey dwelling in the garden of 12 Corfe Crescent; moving current front door of the existing dwelling house to the front on the building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of Corfe Crescent;
 - ii) highway safety in Corfe Crescent in respect of provision for vehicle parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Corfe Crescent is composed of several short terraces of dwellings of a generally consistent design. Where two storey side extensions have been built these are set well back from the front of the house and have a subservient appearance. No 12 is an end of terrace property adjacent to an access lane serving rear parking to various dwellings and a fairly large garage court. There is a side garden area, including a parking space, between the house and access lane.
 4. The proposed dwelling would take up the entire space between the side of the existing house at No 12 and the access lane. Although it would be set back slightly from the front elevation of No 12, it would be not to such an extent as to appear as a subservient feature in the same sense as those existing two storey side extensions in the street. Unlike other existing properties where they are side on to the road or access lane, such as that at No 13, it would not have the same small gap to the side boundary. Its footprint, in following the line of the side boundary would also have varying widths, with the front
-

elevation being significantly narrower than that of No 12. Additionally, there would be no front garden area, other than an access path. These factors would cause the proposed dwelling to appear cramped on the site, in the context of the existing pattern of development in the street.

5. The hipped roof design, dictated by the variable building width, would also stand out as being incompatible with the otherwise gable ends to terraces in the street. The front first floor window shape and design, and the use of timber cladding on part of the elevations, despite intended to be of a colour to match the existing pebble dash, would also be features incompatible with the other dwellings in the street. These factors, together with the cramped appearance, would combine to cause the proposal to have an incongruous and jarring appearance in the context of the existing streetscene.
6. The appellant states that the timber cladding could be replaced with pebble dash or brick to match the existing dwelling. However, plans showing this have not been submitted to enable my proper consideration of any such variation. Nevertheless, that change alone would not overcome the harm that I have otherwise found would be caused in respect of this issue.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposed dwelling would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of Corfe Crescent. As such, in respect of this issue, it would be contrary to policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan including minerals and waste policies (the Local Plan) which together, amongst other things, require development to maintain or enhance the character of the public realm, be of high quality design, and to respond to the local context in terms of appearance, materials, siting, spacing and layout.

Highway safety

8. The Council draws my attention to there being a high demand for on-street parking in Corfe Crescent. Although no survey evidence has been submitted to substantiate this, I saw that to be the case, albeit only a snapshot observation, and that many of the properties in the street do not have on-site parking.
9. The proposed dwelling would have a single parking space to the rear which would meet the Council's parking standards set out in policy T.26 of the Local Plan. However, the proposal would cause No 12, a two bedroom property, to lose one of its existing two on-site parking spaces, where the standard for such a sized property is two spaces. I note that the parking standards are a maximum. I also acknowledge that it is a sustainable location, being within an established settlement and with access to public transport. Nevertheless, I have received no substantive evidence to clearly demonstrate that the existing dwelling, even if only a small two bedroom property, would be unlikely to continue to generate a demand for two cars to fully satisfy the day to day transport needs of its occupiers.
10. It would therefore be likely that occupiers of No 12 would seek to park any second car on the street in Corfe Crescent. In light of the already high demand, this would have the potential to cause indiscriminate parking. That in turn could result in obstructions to the free flow of traffic and the potential for unusual or unexpected vehicle movements that could cause collisions between vehicles.

11. The appellant claims that there are several garages served by the adjacent access lane which are not currently used for parking cars, indicating no current issues with local on-street parking demand. However, I have received no substantive evidence to support those claims. Furthermore, I could not clearly determine from my observations that those garages with openings onto the lane were not used for parking. Some of the properties concerned also have open hardstanding areas accessed from the lane.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would pose a risk to highway safety in Corfe Crescent in respect of provision for vehicle parking. As such, it would be contrary to policies T.24 and T.26 of the Local Plan which together, in respect of this issue, require development to avoid an increase in on-street parking in the vicinity of the site which would detract from highway safety, and having regard to the Council's maximum parking standards.

Conclusion

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

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR