



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/20/3247048

61 Glanville Gardens, Kingswood 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 P19/6806/F, dated 9 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the conversion and extension to existing garage to form attached studio dwelling (one person).
-

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 Issue

3. The main issues in this case are the following:
 - The effect that the proposed dwelling would have on the character and appearance of the host property and of the surrounding area; and
 - Whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for its intended future occupiers, with particular regard to the provision of private garden/external living space.

Reasons for Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. Glanville Gardens is part of a wider suburban residential estate on the eastern side of Bristol. The estate is a pleasant, quiet development which is characterised by mostly two storey, traditionally designed semi-detached and terraced dwellings set back from the highway of similar scale and design, with off road parking and integral garages.
5. There is a clear and consistent architectural character apparent, however there is variety in ridge heights reflecting the undulating topography of the area. The appeal site comprises of a semi-detached unit, with an attached garage

attached to an existing single storey side projection sited next to the highway on a limited and restricted plot. The proposal seeks to convert this garage into living accommodation. Whilst the planning application the subject of this appeal was not a resubmission, I note that previous schemes for similar development have been refused by the Council and dismissed at appeal¹, with the latest, application ref: PK17/4573/F, described by the Council as substantially similar to the scheme before me, although details of this proposal have not been provided.

6. The materials proposed are appropriate and the majority of the proposed building would comprise of the conversion and extension of the existing garage building. However, there is an element of extension also proposed, and whilst the appellants state that the side projection would be reduced from the previous scheme and set slightly further from the boundary, the location of the appeal site means that the dwelling would be sited in a visible and prominent position. The development would still be located, visually, next to the highway which would appear incongruous and cramped. This would be at odds with the carefully designed street layout and particularly the set back from the highway. Consequently, the proposed development would erode the spacious character of the site and its location would have an adverse visual impact to the street scene.
7. In light of the foregoing, it is concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There would therefore be conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006 – 2027 (CS) and policies PSP8 and PSP43 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (LP), which collectively require development to reach a high standard of design which also respects and enhances the character. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other matters, requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

8. As a result of the cramped and restricted plot, the external garden space for the proposed development is limited. The Council measure the total space as 21m², whilst the appeal statement puts this as 25m². Whilst the appellants argue that the development is more akin to a 1 bed flat and the description of development describes it as a 'studio dwelling', the plans show it to be a 1 bed house and therefore either figure would result in the provision of considerably less than the minimum of 40m² required by LP Policy PSP43.
9. Furthermore, the limited garden space is provided in an awkward shape which would be difficult to use and unlikely to be a pleasant area to spend time in. Even if I were to accept the appellant's suggestion that the parking space would not be required, I do not share his view that the off-street parking spaces could be used as a garden area. In my view, it would not be particularly attractive to use or private, given the proximity to the road and neighbouring parking space.
10. Whilst this policy sets out that the figures are guides and could be relaxed for example in high density areas of regeneration, this is not the case with this

¹ PK16/4507/F, dismissed at appeal (ref: APP/P0119/W/17/3172137) dated 10 July 2017. PK17/4573/F, dismissed at appeal (ref: APP/P0119/W/18/3198252) dated 25 June 2018.

typical suburban location. In light of the foregoing, the proposal would not therefore provide acceptable living conditions for the intended future occupiers.

11. There is conflict therefore with the requirements of CS Policy CS1 and LP Policies PSP8 and PSP43 which, amongst other matters, require development to achieve the highest possible design standards and provide amenity space of sufficient size and functional space.

Planning Balance

12. I note that the Council have no objection to, amongst other matters, the principle of residential development in this location or with regards to the impact the development would have upon the amenities of neighbours. These are however neutral matters not in favour of the development.
13. I acknowledge that the dwelling as proposed would provide an efficient use of the site, which would contribute towards local housing provision on a relatively accessible site. Furthermore, I gather that the site is used for fly tipping which would be removed by the proposal. However, these benefits do not individually or cumulatively outweigh the harm that it would cause to the area's character and appearance or the substandard garden space provided.
14. Furthermore, the appellants set out that the scheme has attracted the support of neighbours and a Councillor, however, this does not change my views on the main issues.

Recommendation

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

B Phillips

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR