



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/17/3176312

4 Parkside Avenue, Winterbourne BS36 1LU

- 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 Andrew White against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref PT17/0378/F, dated 26 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a single storey new bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. On the application form it is stated that building work has already started, but has not been completed. I observed on my visit that the garage that previously stood on the site has been demolished and that a single storey structure, similar to that on the drawings, has been constructed. However, as I understand that the works are incomplete, and as I observed differences in the fenestration on the front elevation, I have treated the scheme as a proposal rather than as the retention of the existing development.
3. Although I do not have all the details of the site's long planning history, in reaching my decision I have had regard to the submitted information, including a previous appeal decision (Ref: APP/P0119/W/16/3151536) ('previous appeal') against the refusal of planning permission for a single storey dwelling.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether future occupants of the proposed bungalow would experience satisfactory living conditions, with particular regard to outdoor space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The dwellings in this part of Parkside Avenue are predominantly two storey, with pitched roofs, and finished in a mix of brick and render. Many have bay

windows. The dwellings are typically arranged in semi-detached pairs, and although some have often set-down or set-back garages or other structures to the side, viewed from the road there is usually a noticeable gap between the buildings' principal front faces. Close to the appeal site that cohesive character diminishes somewhat as Nos. 1A and 2 are detached. However, whilst the former is single storey, both have pitched roofs, elements of detailing, and a reasonably sized gap to the neighbouring dwellings.

6. The proposed bungalow would be single storey, with a flat roof. That form, and the absence of any significant architectural detailing, would give it a very squat, bland, and rectilinear appearance compared to other buildings in the area. The harm that that would cause to the streetscene would be exacerbated by the very narrow gap to the dwellings either side. For those reasons, the scheme would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appellant claims that the building would be constructed under permitted development rights as an 'incidental building', and that an application could then be made to change its use to a dwelling. However, the scheme before me is for the construction of a bungalow, and the floor plans show that it would include a kitchen, living room, bedroom and wash facilities commensurate with independent habitation. Although the Council states in its delegated report that an incidental building here, of the same 'appearance' as this proposal, would constitute permitted development, there is a separate procedure under s192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by which the lawfulness of such a scheme could be established. I have very limited evidence before me to assess that matter and I therefore give it very limited weight in my decision.
8. Amongst other things, and in general terms, Policies CS1, CS16 and CS17 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy 2006 – 2027 (2013) ('Core Strategy'), and Policy H4 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan 2006 ('LP') require that development is of the highest possible design standard, which respects and enhances the site, its context and the local character. For the reasons above, on this issue, the scheme would conflict with those policies; and with the requirement for good design, which reinforces local distinctiveness, and does not harm the local area in paragraphs 53, 56 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework').

Living conditions

9. Much of the proposed bungalow's rear face would be close to the boundary. Its rear garden would be narrow and set to one side. However, unlike the previous appeal scheme, this proposal would include the removal of a first floor window at 4 Parkside Avenue. Subject to that matter, and the provision of suitable boundary treatment, being appropriately controlled, the scheme would provide a reasonably private area for the intended occupants. Although that area would be the same shape as in the previous appeal, and would be small compared to others nearby, this one bedroom property would be likely to have few occupants. They would have an adequate area of accessible, private and functional space to sit outside and to perform typical domestic outdoor tasks.
10. For those reasons, on this issue, the scheme would not conflict with the general design, outdoor space and amenity requirements of Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS16 and CS17, or LP Policy H4, or with the Framework's design requirements at paragraphs 53 and 56.

11. The Council also refers to Policy PSP43 of the Policies, Sites and Places (Proposed Submission) Plan 2017. As that Plan has not been adopted I afford that policy limited weight. However, from the evidence before me, the proposed rear garden would exceed its minimum amenity space requirements. That supports my conclusion that the outdoor space provided here would be adequate. The scheme would not conflict with that emerging policy.

Conclusions

12. Summing up, whilst the scheme would provide the occupants of the proposed bungalow with an adequate area of reasonably private and useable outdoor space, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. For that reason, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR