



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/W/19/3241110

18 Concorde Way, Gloucester, GL4 4PU

- 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 Jason Wellington against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00808/FUL, dated 29 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is 'erection of attached house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for an attached house at 18 Concorde Way, Gloucester, GL4 4PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/00808/FUL, dated 29 July 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Procedural Issues

2. The application plans show one parking space at the front of the house. At the appeal stage the appellant has submitted an amended plan for two spaces at the rear of the garden, which would be accessed from the cul-de-sac behind. The occupiers of the cul-de-sac have not had an opportunity to comment on this amendment and this could lead to possible prejudice. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the original plans (19/27/01, 19/27/02), upon which the Council based its decision.

Main Issues

3. The effects of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the area;
 - Highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The proposal is to attach a new house to the side of a semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot currently occupied by a yard and garden. The site is within a 1960s estate of generally uniform semi-detached houses and bungalows built of brick and tile, most of which remain unaltered to any significant extent. There are large gaps between properties, mature back gardens and wide verges giving the area a spacious character.

5. A third house to form a terrace is not typical in the area, but as it is a narrow addition and matches materials and all building lines, I do not consider the proposals a negative response to the urban grain and form of the area, or to create a structure that would appear imbalanced to the extent that it would cause harm to character and appearance.
6. The resultant side elevation would be closer to the cul-de-sac, but I consider that the principle of this is established by the current configuration, and as the house benefits from being opposite an open, grassy area it would not harmfully reduce the spacious character of the area. In my opinion, in light of nearby bungalows and properties similarly not having side windows, the change to presentation of a blank side elevation, whilst not an improvement, would have an essentially neutral effect on the established character and appearance of the site.
7. For the reasons above I find that the proposals would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the area and are therefore not harmful or in conflict with Policy SD4 and Policy SD10 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2017 (Core Strategy), which ensure among other things, that development responds positively to the character of the surroundings, urban structure and grain.

Highway Safety

8. The site is on the corner of Concorde Way and the Forsyte Way cul-de-sac. I observed no moving cars during a site visit on a weekday morning, albeit this is only a brief snapshot in time. Given that the street leads to a series of cul-de-sacs, it is reasonable to assume that even at peak times this street would not be heavily trafficked. In addition, given the residential nature of the area, lack of road markings, and the presence of on-street parking, I have assumed that travel speeds are low. Visibility is good in all directions from the front of the plot by virtue of it being on the corner and in the absence of any high walls or hedging. Based on this, in my opinion the proximity of the access to Concorde Way would not increase risk to highway safety
9. The Council have requested two parking spaces, which in the absence of adopted parking standards, is a reasonable starting point for a 3-bedroom house in this location. Given the close proximity to public transport links and the city centre, and availability of safe on-street parking observed during the site visit, I have concluded that a reduction from this would not be harmful in this case. The proposed provision of one parking space would therefore provide adequate parking
10. Policy INF1 of the Core Strategy and Paragraphs 108 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 (NPPF) together require that development provides safe and efficient access to the highway network and that planning permission be granted only when the impact of the development is not severe. Based on the observations above, I do not consider that the effect of the parking proposals would be severe, or that it would amount to any significant effects on highway safety.

Other Matters

11. I have also noted the concerns about loss of privacy raised by neighbours. The additional house would be at the end of the row and separated by a garden,

fencing and mature vegetation and I conclude that there would be no significant effect on neighbouring living conditions, with particular regard to privacy.

Conditions

12. The Council requests that 6 conditions be imposed and I will consider these under the same numbers. In addition to the statutory time limit (1), I consider that (2) is necessary in the interests of certainty. (3) is to ensure that satisfactory drainage arrangements are provided in accordance with the sustainability objectives of local policies. I have not imposed the Council's suggested condition (4) to remove specified national permitted development rights because I am not satisfied that such controls are necessary in the circumstances of this case. A condition (5) requiring external materials to match the existing building is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area. I have changed (6) to 'at least one car' from 'two' for the reasons above. Details including visibility splays are required in the interests of highway safety.

Conclusions

13. In light of the above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application form and drawing numbers 19/27/01 and 19/27/02.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details for the disposal of surface water have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details submitted shall include proposals for the disposal of surface water in accordance with the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and shall be implemented prior to the first use or occupation of the dwelling and maintained thereafter for the life of the development
- 4) The external facing brickwork to the dwelling hereby permitted shall match, in colour, form and texture that of No 18 Concorde Way.
- 5) Prior to the commencement of development, details for the parking provision for at least one car, and design details for a safe and accessible access point (including visibility splays) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be built and at all times maintained in accordance with the approved details and the aforementioned details shall be completed before first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.