



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/20/3250010

Snaefell, The Drive, Charfield, Wotton Under Edge GL12 8HX

- 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 Darren Hawkins against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/19195/F, dated 19 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing bungalow to facilitate the erection of a pair of semi detached chalet bungalows and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a single, detached dwelling located along a private road, The Drive, serving around 10 dwellings in total. Whilst there was variety in terms of the detailed appearance of these dwellings, for example some were two-storey in height whilst others were bungalows, all were detached properties. I observed that the frontages to The Drive were generally spacious and included areas of lawn as well as parking for vehicles. There was further variety in architectural style within the wider area where there were both semi-detached and terraced properties present. Still, there was a general sense of spaciousness in the streets of the area, including that along which the appeal site is located, which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal would result in the demolition of the existing bungalow and its replacement with a pair of semi-detached chalet bungalows. The construction of two dwellings would necessitate the formation of two points of vehicular access, each with a narrow, linear parking area. With the further inclusion of a pathway providing access to each of the dwellings, together with a small area of lawn, a bin and cycle store serving each of the dwellings and the subdivision of the frontage, the development would have a distinctly cramped and cluttered appearance which would, in my view, give the impression of it being squeezed into the site. It would unacceptably diminish the spaciousness of the area, to

which I have referred to above. In this regard, it would also depart from the layout of development in the area, resulting in a discordant and jarring visual appearance.

5. I acknowledge that the site benefits from a previously granted planning permission for the erection of a single replacement dwelling and that the approved dwelling is almost identical to that which is proposed within the scheme before me, in terms of the buildings scale and appearance. However, the frontage of that scheme provided an open and spacious parking area, reflecting the character of surrounding development. Moreover, it lacked the double access point, linear parking arrangement and other elements necessitated by the division of the site to accommodate two dwellings. As such, the current proposal would be markedly different in appearance from that previously approved and the approved scheme would not result in the harm that I have identified. Consequently, the existence of the previous permission does not provide a justification for allowing the appeal.
6. Accordingly, I find that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with policies CS1, CS16 and CS17 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (2013), insofar as they seek to ensure that the form of development respects the character of a sites context, that new housing development contributes to a high quality of design and that housing contributes to the character of a location. The scheme would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge that no objections have been raised in regard to the principle of residential development on the site, the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, transport matters, nor ecological or landscape matters. The lack of harm in these respects does not however outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR