



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/19/3233368

1 Queens Road, Cadbury Heath, Bristol BS30 8EF

- 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 Anthony Bracey against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/4182/F, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effect that the proposed dwelling would have on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. Queens Road is a quiet suburban residential road, terminating at its northern end with Park Crescent and Newton Road, set around an open crescent. The appeal site is located on the corner of this open space and forms the open corner plot. Queens Road, Park Crescent and the surrounding streets are characterised by semi-detached and terraced properties set back from the highway in a consistent building line, which also extends around the crescent. A large three storey block also sits on the crescent with commercial units on the ground floor and residential above. Whilst individually the dwellings are not of a particularly high quality architecturally, there is a coherent and open, spacious character evident.
5. The two storey nature of the dwelling would be in keeping with the scale of surrounding dwellings. The architectural detailing and proposed mix of brick, render and concrete tiles would also not look out of place in the context of the detailing and varied materials of surrounding properties. The detached nature of the dwelling however, would be at odds with the surrounding pattern of development, and the dwelling would sit prominently on the corner of the

crescent presenting a prominent side elevation which would appear awkwardly and incongruously proud of the established Park Crescent building line. Moreover, the proposal would result in a significant reduction in the open area between the host property and No 12 Park Crescent which would be harmful to the spacious character of the area.

6. In light of the foregoing it is concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area. There would therefore be conflict with Policies CS1 and CS16 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006 – 2027 and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan, which collectively require development to reach a high standard of design which is informed by and respects local character respecting the form and building line of the street and surrounding area. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other matters, requires development to be sympathetic to local character.
7. It is noted that the appellant points out that no objection is raised by the Council with respect to other matters including highway impacts and impact upon the occupants of neighbouring properties. These are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of the development. The benefits of the addition of 1 dwelling to the national housing stock carries limited weight, and there is no evidence before me regarding the particular need in this area. This does not therefore outweigh the harm and policy conflict identified.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR