



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/22/3292223

Land North of 15 Edward Road, Clevedon, North Somerset BS21 7DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Danielle against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/2660/PIP, dated 20 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is 1No. Self Build Duplex Dwelling with parking and access from Channel Road
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site address on the application form is incorrect. I have therefore taken the site address from the Council's decision notice, which is also shown on the appeal form.
3. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that permission in principle is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle consent route has two stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second stage ('technical details consent') is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these two stages.
4. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent Technical Details Consent application if permission in principle is granted. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

5. With the above in mind, the main issue is whether the location of the proposed development would be acceptable, having regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises an area of land that was previously the rear garden of 15 Edward Road. The appeal site is accessed from Channel Road. Although properties in the vicinity are of different design styles and construction ages, the area largely comprises detached two storey and bungalow dwellings set in generous plots with long rear gardens. The plot sizes and structure, in

particular, are noticeable features that makes an important and positive contribution to the character of this part of Edward Road and Channel Road. Additionally, dwellings are in a frontage layout, set back from the highway behind front gardens and parking areas, which combined with the tree lined street, creates a pleasant sense of spaciousness and a verdant feel.

7. Illustrative plans have been submitted showing the proposed layout and elevations. I have treated them accordingly. However, the location plan showing the extent of the appeal site would provide a very small curtilage, significantly lacking the spaciousness of others around it, leading to a much higher building to space ratio. It would result in a cramped form of development which would be at odds with and erode the established development pattern and urban grain of the area.
8. I have had regard to the appellants submission that matters relating to character and appearance should be dealt with at Technical Details stage. However, I consider that the submission details how the location, use and amount of development proposed would conflict with development plan policies relating to settlement pattern and character and appearance.
9. As such, it would be contrary to Policies CS12 and CS31 of the North Somerset Council Core Strategy (2017) and Policies DM32 and DM37 of the North Somerset Council Development Management Policies (2016). These policies, amongst other things, requires new development to be sensitive to local character and ensure the layout respects the existing street scene and plot sizes are in keeping with nearby properties. The proposed development would also be at odds with paragraphs 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. As a result, Paragraph 11 d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
11. The erection of a single dwelling would make a positive contribution, albeit limited, to the Council's housing supply. It would also provide economic benefits, sustaining employment during its construction. In addition, the future occupants would make a positive contribution to the local economy. However, the scale of the scheme would limit its associated socioeconomic benefits. The appellant states that the proposed development is for a self-build dwelling, and this has been presented as a benefit. No evidence has been provided of the numbers of permissions granted by the Council for self-build dwellings. Nevertheless, if I were to find that insufficient permission had been granted a self-build proposal would need to be secured via a planning obligation and one is not before me. I can only therefore attribute this matter very little weight.
12. I have found that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area in the manner I have described above. I ascribe significant weight to this, which would conflict with the design aims of the Framework and be long lasting. Therefore, and in regard to the specific

circumstances of this case, the adverse impacts of granting a planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. It would not therefore be sustainable development for which the presumption in favour applies.

Conclusion

13. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework, which would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. The appeal should therefore be dismissed

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR