



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2022

by Lewis Condé BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/22/3295048

92 Long Road, Mangotsfield BS16 9HP

- 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 Sampson against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
- The application Ref P21/08064/F, dated 18 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2022.
- The development proposed is described as 'Erection of single storey residential property with associated parking, garden, bin and bike storage (Re-submission of P21/06491/F)'.

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 appeal site forms part of the rear garden of nos. 92 and 92A Long Road, which comprise two-storey dwellings that front onto Long Road. It is located and accessed via a narrow vehicular track off Long Road. The track is an adopted highway that wraps around the appeal site and provides access to the rear gardens and garages serving properties on both Long Road and Mangotsfield Road.
4. The surrounding area has a suburban residential character. It is largely characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The dwellings, for the most part, share a general consistency in scale and appearance, albeit vary somewhat in their precise finishing materials and detailing. Some nearby properties have garages or outbuildings within their rear gardens, but there are no examples of backland residential developments within the immediate vicinity of the site.
5. While there are examples of bungalows nearby, unlike the proposal, these have a strong frontage onto Mangotsfield Road. Additionally, the proposal relates more closely to the two-storey dwellings on Long Road, given its proposed access arrangements and position within the rear gardens of properties on that street.
6. Dwellings in the immediate area also have a predominantly linear layout and display significant road frontage. The appeal scheme, through its backland position, would therefore be in marked contrast to the prevailing residential

grain and neither reflect nor respect the established layout of development. Additionally, the resultant plot size would also be significantly smaller than neighbouring properties, which would result in the proposal having a rather cramped appearance.

7. It has been highlighted that the proposal meets the Council's and/or national specified standards including accommodation size, amenity space and parking provision. Nevertheless, in the context which the appeal proposal is located, the plot would still appear small and cramped.
8. It is also suggested that there would be a general lack of visual harm as the proposal would not be prominent within the streetscene. However, there is a nearby public footpath that provides a route from Mangotsfield Road to Long Road, that runs near the site and would afford users prominent views of the proposed development. In any case, a lack of street frontage or visual prominence does not result in a reduced requirement for high standards of design and layout.
9. Whilst the surrounding area does represent a sustainable location for residential development, the proposed backland location would nonetheless be uncharacteristic of the surrounding pattern of development.
10. The appellant suggests that the proposal conforms with Policies CS16 and CS17, through contributing to a choice of dwellings in the area. The development may be deemed to comply with the broad thrust of these policies, but the need for high-quality design and for proposals to reflect the character of the area is still a requirement of Policies CS16 and CS17.
11. Overall, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS1, CS16 and CS17 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy 2006 – 2027 (adopted 2013) and Policies PSP1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted 2017) (Local Plan). Together these policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure development achieves a high standard of design, that respects the form of the surrounding area, and makes a positive contribution to the distinctiveness of its locality. Likewise, the proposal is not deemed to accord with the policy ambitions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of promoting high standards of design.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred to various bungalow developments that the Council has previously approved, including some that are identified as being of a backland nature. I have limited details of those cases, including their precise planning circumstances. However, they appear to be located some distance from the appeal site and, as such, are likely to have somewhat different contexts. In any case, I am not bound by the previous decisions of the Council.
13. The Council has not referred to Local Plan Policy PSP38 in its reason for refusal. The policy relates specifically to development within existing residential curtilages, including new dwellings. The appellant indicates that the scheme complies with this policy, which is deemed to be of more specific relevance to the proposal. Amongst other matters, Policy PSP38 seeks for new developments to respect the building line, form, scale and proportions of the

street and surrounding area. Given my findings above, the development would also not comply with Policy PSP38. Consequently, this does not weigh in favour of the proposed scheme.

14. The proposal would provide modest social and economic benefits associated with the delivery of a new dwelling. However, these would not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above and having regard to the development plan as a whole, and all other material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

Lewis Condé

INSPECTOR