
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/20/3255961

37 Brockley Close, Little Stoke, Bristol BS34 6HA

- 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 Abigail Palmer against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/16688/F, dated 8 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of attached dwelling with new access and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development has been taken from the appeal forms and the decision notice, which more accurately describe what is proposed. The appeal has been dealt with accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is located directly adjacent to the existing two storey dwelling at 37 Brockley Close, within its side garden, which is tapered and not of a consistent width along its length. The existing dwelling forms part of a wider terrace with three other dwellings of the same character and appearance. The dwellings are of brick and tile construction and include small front extensions which in general are symmetrically composed in a pleasing manner. The plots of each dwelling are also uniform in terms of their length, width and general arrangement.
5. The proposal would introduce an attached two storey dwelling, which because of the tapered nature of the site, would require a notched form of construction towards its frontage. This is a design feature that is unusual within the existing context and would ultimately upset the prevailing symmetry and uniformity of the existing dwellings within the terrace. Furthermore, it is representative of the fact the plot is too small to accommodate a dwelling of appropriate proportions or design. Consequently, the proposal would lead to a misbalancing of the street scene that is uncharacteristic of the locality.

6. The building line, ridgeline and use of materials associated with the proposal is consistent with the existing terrace and the garden areas are generally reflective of the prevailing arrangement in the same context. However, these conformities do not overcome the harm generated by the notched form of construction, which is not present in any of the other terraced dwellings. The wider locality does show some variation in the pattern of development and the arrangement of dwellings. However, the issue at hand in this case is the dwelling's specific interface with the existing terrace, and the effects on the wider locality therein.
7. Overall, the proposal would deliver a dwelling on a plot of land that is too small to comfortably accommodate it, creating a cramped pattern of development requiring an unusual design solution that harms the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy 2013, and PSP1 of the Policies Sites and Places Plan 2017. Among other things, these seek to ensure proposals respond constructively to the buildings and characteristics that make a particularly positive contribution to the distinctiveness of the area.

Other Matters

8. Any contribution that the proposal makes to housing land supply would be limited and has not changed the assessment of the main issue. In any event, there is no evidence in front of me about the housing land supply position within the area, in order gauge the relative weight of the matter, independent of the fact it would be a limited contribution in and of itself. In a similar context, other social and economic benefits would be limited in scale. Whether or not the proposal comprises infill development, its otherwise acceptable position within settlement limits, and the amount of private outdoor living space available to future occupants, does not overcome the harm associated with the main issue.

Conclusion

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

Liam Page

INSPECTOR