
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by L Page BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/20/3256107

14 Williams Close, Longwell Green, Bristol BS30 9BS

- 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 Ian Fry against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/16735/F, dated 13 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of 1 bedroom bungalow attached to number 14 and ancillary 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 site is located within the side garden of the existing dwelling at 14 Williams Close, which is a two storey semi-detached property on the corner of the highway. As a result of being on the corner of the highway, the side garden, and the site therein, is tapered towards its frontage and generally much narrower compared to the plot of the existing dwelling.
4. The existing dwelling is consistent with the wider pattern of development in that the majority of other dwellings in the locality are mostly uniform in character and appearance; they are semi-detached, two storeys in height and on relatively spacious plots. Some of the dwellings exhibit small extensions, such as attached garages, porches and other such additions but these appear limited in scale and are clearly subservient to their respective host dwelling.
5. The proposal would introduce a bungalow attached to the existing dwelling, which would appear substantially larger than other extensions in the locality. Consequently, it would alter the design of the existing dwelling, and disrupt its uniformity with other semi-detached dwellings nearby.
6. Furthermore, the tapered nature and smaller scale of the site, would mean the proposal appears cramped compared to other dwellings on relatively spacious plots. Its prominent position on the corner of the highway would draw the public's attention and exacerbate these issues, harming the character and appearance of the area.

7. It is acknowledged that the street scene is likely to have evolved since it was originally planned and constructed, including the addition of various extensions and other works to the dwellings therein.
8. However, as already indicated, the nature of the proposal as a separate dwelling is substantially larger than other ancillary extensions in the locality, which offer a greater degree of subservience in comparison to their respective host dwelling. Consequently, the effects of the proposal on the street scene, in conjunction with its prominent location, are more pronounced.
9. The boundary treatments at the site, including hedging and walling, would mitigate the visual impact when directly adjacent to the side of the site. However, views directly in front or from behind would not benefit from mitigation to the same degree, and therefore the effects of the proposal would still remain pronounced.
10. Policies CS16 and CS17 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 deal with housing density and diversity but are referenced within the Council's decision notice. However, these do not appear to relate to the design dispute and are not precisely relevant under this main issue.
11. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2013, which among other things seeks to secure the highest possible standards of design.

Other Matters

12. The proposal's location and the principle of development, including matters relating to the efficient use of land and highway impact, are not disputed. However, these matters would not directly mitigate the harm associated with the main issue.
13. In a similar context, given the limited scale of the proposal, the benefits pursuant to housing land supply, and other socio-economic factors therein, would be limited and not outweigh the main issue. Furthering this point, although there is anecdotal need for certain types of housing in general, the precise need in this particular area has not been demonstrated. Consequently, it is not possible to determine whether the matter carries more than the limited weight ascribed.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Liam Page

INSPECTOR