The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/20/3246725
8A St Peters Rise, Headley Park, Bristol BS13 7LY

- 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 Stephen McGourty against the decision of Bristol City Council.
- The application Ref 19/05462/H, dated 7 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2020.
- The development proposed is described as a detached garage to front of property with hardstanding for car.

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 of the garage on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. St Peters Rise is a lengthy, pleasant residential street, made up mostly of traditional terraced dwellings but with some detached and some semi-detached dwellings evident further from the appeal site. Near the appeal site itself are terraced dwellings, set increasingly back from the road. The setback of the building line, which is substantial at this point, gives the road an open spacious character. The topography of the street, which rises south to north also means the appeal property and its neighbours are set above the road level.

5. Given this height difference, there is a variety of front garden treatment, with some dwellings having off street parking areas dug into the rising frontage, some with sloping gardens, and some gardens set differing levels with substantial hard landscaping as identified by the appellant. These levels, hard landscaping and boundary fencing are not however comparable with the visual impact that would be caused by the larger scale, mass and bulk of the proposed garage. As a result, whilst it would be set into the sloping frontage, even with a natural roof, it would appear prominent and incongruously forward of any other building.

6. Given the scale of the proposed garage in relation to the two storey house, it would appear subservient to that property. However, as stated above, due to its siting, the garage building would detract from the existing open character of the street.

7. The appellant points to the added security benefits of the proposed garage together with the opportunity for an electric charging point helping to address the business requirements of the appellant. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the garage would formalise the existing off-street parking space, albeit it would do so in a manner that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

8. However, space would still be available for charging a vehicle and I have seen no conclusive evidence of any other means of security that may be available for the appellants tools. I therefore give these benefits limited weight. Consequently, they do not individually or cumulatively outweigh the harm identified to the street scene.

9. As such, it is concluded that the proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and DM26, DM27 DM29 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 (DM), which collectively advocate that new development should deliver high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character. This is in addition to the advice set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (2005) (SPD) which sets out that garages should be set back from the main building line. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires at paragraph 127 that developments, amongst other matters, are sympathetic to local character and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellants comments on the council's lack of dialogue, however this should be addressed with the council, and is not a matter for consideration under this appeal.

Conclusion

11. 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

12. 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