



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2020

**by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 26 October 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/20/3245822**

**6 Court Road, Kingswood, Bristol BS15 9QD**

- 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 Ms Aneta Mackell against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
  - The application Ref P19/14006/F, dated 2 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2019.
  - The development proposed is conversion of existing double garage into self contained 1 bed annex.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. Following my site visit it was evident that works to convert the double garage have been undertaken, and these works are different from that on the plans before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I have based my decision on the submitted plans rather than what has been built.
3. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the planning application form. The Council's decision notice added the phrase 'ancillary to the main dwelling'. This would imply the proposal is not for a separate dwelling. Accordingly, the Council's decision notice described the development as 'Conversion of existing double garage to form self-contained 1 bed annex ancillary to main dwelling'. The appellant has used this description of development on the appeal form. As such for the avoidance of doubt I have assessed the proposal on that basis, rather than as the creation of a separate independent residential unit.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

5. The appeal site is located at the junction of Court Road and Courtney Road. The proposal relates to a double garage within the rear garden of the appeal property which given its scale and position adjacent to Courtney Road, is a prominent feature when viewed from public views in the street scene.

6. The predominant character of the built form along Courtney Road in the immediate vicinity of the site, is of two storey terraced properties fronting the road. The large single storey garage is positioned side on to Courtney Road with a blank side and rear elevation facing the street scene. Together with the basic form of the building when viewed from the east along Courtney Road it is viewed as an outbuilding associated with the appeal property in this context. The evidence indicates that the front elevation of the building previously had a double garage door, therefore public views of this prominent frontage would have been of an incidental outbuilding associated with the appeal property.
7. The plans before me propose changes to the front elevation including replacing the garage door with 4 large vertical windows and a central door. This level of glazing proposed on this single storey building is excessive and its form on this prominent elevation would be wholly uncharacteristic of the existing dwelling and properties in the area. In this case, the proposed amendments to the front elevation to create the residential annex would change the character of this outbuilding and it would have a very different impact on the street scene compared to a double garage.
8. Given the basic form of the building, the excessive glazing would appear intrusive, and out of character in public views of the frontage from Courtney Road and Court Road. On this basis, the proposal would be a prominent and incongruent feature and would fail to integrate successfully into the street scene. Although the appellant states that the works to the garage could be carried out as permitted development, this matter is not before me in this appeal.
9. For the above reasons, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2027 (2013) and Policy PSP1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017). Amongst other things, these policies seek that development should incorporate the highest standards of design, and the form and detailing should respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the site and context and contribute positively to the distinctiveness of a place. It would also conflict with Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that proposals are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

## **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal does not succeed.

*S Thomas*

INSPECTOR