



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

by S Thomas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/20/3249155

12 Callicroft Road, Patchway Bristol BS34 5BS

- 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 Mohinder Sangha against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P19/15899/F, dated 29 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed erection of 1 no two-bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and (ii) whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers with regard to amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within the rearmost part of the now severed original rear garden of No 12 Callicroft Road. That property has recently been extended and converted into two dwellings. The appeal site has a frontage to Hazeldene Road. The properties in Callicroft Road are predominantly semi-detached with substantial rear gardens, whereas those along Hazeldene Road are of more varying character.
4. The proposed dwelling would occupy a substantial footprint compared with the plot size, and the side and rear elevations would be built in very close proximity to the site's boundaries. Consequently, the dwelling would appear cramped and shoe-horned onto the site, and at odds with the spacious character of the area. Also, the proposed main amenity area would be located to the side of the new dwelling, separated from the highway by a hardstanding area for parking. This is not considered representative or characteristic of the pattern of development in either Callicroft Road or Hazeldene Road. Consequently, the dwelling would fail to integrate successfully into the street scene.

5. For the reasons above, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy CS1 and CS16 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) (Core Strategy) and Policy PSP1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (PSPP). These policies seek that development should be of the highest standards of design and site planning; and that siting should be informed by and respect the character of both the site and context.

Living Conditions

6. The new dwelling would have an amenity area to the side, as well as to the front. There would also be parking spaces for two cars, fronting Hazledene Road, only one of which would be for the proposed new dwelling. Policy PSP43 sets minimum space standards of 50sqm for two-bedroom houses. The appellant says the proposal complies with this requirement whereas the Council has concluded that the garden area for the proposed dwelling would be 36 sqm, and therefore significantly below it. The supporting text to the policy notes that the space standards are a guide.
7. From my own observations, I consider that the proposed area to the side of the proposed property would be limited in size. It would be restricted, cramped and directly adjacent to the proposed parking area. Whilst I note a small front garden would also be provided, this would provide little privacy from passers-by. As such, I do not consider that would provide a functional and useable amenity space. The appellant has argued that the appeal site is in close proximity to areas of public open space, but this does not alter the requirement for acceptable provision of private amenity space. Overall, I do not consider the proposed amenity space provision for the dwelling to be acceptable for future occupiers.
8. Moreover, the original host property, as a result of the subdivision of the existing garden, would retain a rear amenity area of approximately only 50sqm, which would be below required standards of 60sqm for a 3-bedroom dwelling. Whilst I note that this property has a paved area to the front, this forms a parking area and has no privacy. Therefore, the proposal would result in inadequate provision of functional amenity space to serve the existing dwelling.
9. For the above reasons, the proposal would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers with regard to amenity space. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies CS1 and CS16 of the Core Strategy and Policy PSP43 of the PSPP. These policies together seek that development be of a high quality and provide adequate levels of private outdoor space which are of a sufficient size and functional.
10. I have had regard to the appeal decisions referred by the appellant. However, the planning circumstances are not comparable, and I have assessed the appeal scheme on its own merits.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

S Thomas INSPECTOR