



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/17/3172137

Land adjacent to 61 Glanville Gardens, Kingswood, South Gloucestershire BS15 9WX

- 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 Mr M Cooke against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref PK16/4507/F, dated 28 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the conversion and extension of the garage to form a self-contained one bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

2. As the date on the planning application form that I have been provided with is unclear, I have taken that information from part C of the appeal form.
3. The Council's statement and committee report reference the private amenity space standards in Policy PSP43 of its emerging South Gloucestershire Local Plan – Policies, Sites and Places. However, the Council states that limited weight can be given to that policy; I concur. Consequently, in identifying the main issue, I have had regard to the analysis in its statement and report, and to the design objectives of Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy 2006 - 2027 (2013) ('Core Strategy') which is referred to in the decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Many of the dwellings in this part of Glanville Gardens are arranged in pairs, or in rows, which are set back a short distance from the highway. Some have detached or attached garages. The front faces of the buildings are often staggered, and many have variable rooflines which partly reflect the local topography.
6. The proposal would involve the conversion and extension of a garage, which is attached to a converted garage and a semi-detached pair of dwellings. Taken as a whole, the resultant building would have a roofline which would cascade

- down in a series of steps, and a staggered front face. In those regards, although this part of the building would have a rather squat and elongated appearance, it would nevertheless broadly reflect the form of some nearby buildings.
7. However, the front corner of the extension, along with its side wall and much of its front face, would be sited very close to the edge of the highway. That siting would be very much at odds with the typically greater set back from the highway of other dwellings in the area. Given the small size and shape of this site, and the very limited area of amenity space that would be left between the building and its boundaries, the scheme would appear very cramped. The highway wraps around a significant proportion of the site, therefore having regard to existing and proposed levels, that impact would be prominent in the streetscene. Although the appellant states that the majority of the building already exists, the scheme would jar conspicuously with the area's prevailing character.
 8. Whilst I observed that some nearby garages, including at No. 61, have been converted to provide additional habitable space, those examples do not change my conclusions regarding the harm that would be caused by this proposed conversion and extension. The appellant cites examples of small dwellings at Appendix A of his appeal statement, and in his design statement. However, most of those are some distance from this site, and the circumstances at 2A Pettigrove Road, which appears to involve a detached building behind another dwelling, but set well back from the road, are materially different.
 9. The scheme would be appropriately finished with matching materials. Nevertheless, for the above reasons, it would significantly harm the character and appearance of this area. Thus it would conflict with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS1 that development should achieve the highest possible design standards; and respect and enhance the character, distinctiveness, and amenity of the site and its context.
 10. Although the scheme would make use of a rather untidy and overgrown parcel of land, which I understand has been subject to fly tipping, I am not satisfied that this proposal is the only way in which those issues could be addressed. However, in accordance with various development plan policies, it would involve an efficient use of the site, making a modest contribution to housing supply with a one bedroom, relatively affordable dwelling, that could be energy efficient.
 11. I have had regard to representations in favour and against the scheme. I have also noted the site's planning history, and, although I do not have all the details of those schemes, I have considered the appellant's attempts to address previous reasons for refusal. However, having considered this proposal on its merits, its limited benefits do not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause to the area's character and appearance.
 12. As the scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR