



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2022

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/W/22/3302416

20 Manor Road, Saltford BS31 3DN

- 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 and Mrs Creed against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
- The application Ref 22/00172/FUL, dated 15 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2022.
- The development proposed is the erection of a 3 bed attached dwelling (Resubmission).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The above description of development above is taken from part E of the appeal form and the Council's Decision Notice. This is in the interest of clarity.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached dwelling set back from and facing the road. An access to 2 dwellings at the rear runs past the side of the property. Whilst the garden of the appeal property is truncated by these dwellings at the rear and there is a combination of detached and semi-detached units, each property sits comfortably within a sizable plot and there remains a sense of space which is shared by the majority of the street scene which gives it a pleasant open and spacious feel. This contributes positively to its character and appearance.
5. The provision of a new access would result in an increased amount of off-street parking to the front of the dwellings and hardstanding. However, there are examples of similar amount of hardstanding nearby the appeal site, such as directly opposite, and some frontage garden space to No 20 would remain. There are also examples of separate accesses in close proximity nearby. As such, this element of the proposal would not appear incongruous, and I find no conflict in this respect with Policy D4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking Plan (2017) (PP) which sets out that car parking design should not dominate the design of the development.
6. However, the addition of a narrower dwelling unit to the side elevation of No 20 would take up more of its garden and the pleasant sense of spaciousness would

be eroded by the considerably smaller curtilage afforded to No 20. In addition, whilst there are dwellings within the street scene that extend close to both side boundaries, the proposed new dwelling would sit in a noticeably narrower plot and, as a result, also have a smaller garden than the neighbouring properties and would appear cramped and squeezed into the available space. The dwelling would appear incongruous in the context of the existing pattern of plot sizes along this part of Manor Road.

7. The appellant points to a two storey side extension approved to the appeal property¹. Whilst the Council found the extension to be acceptable in terms of design, scale and materials, and notwithstanding the different design, there is a material difference in the impact on the character and appearance of the surroundings that a side extension would have over that of a new dwelling, which would require the separation of the plot. As such this scheme is not comparable to the proposal before me.
8. The lack of harm identified with regards to matters such as parking, bin storage or outlook are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
9. In light of the above it is concluded that the proposal would detract from the existing character of the area. There would therefore be conflict with PP Policies D1, D2, D5 and D7 which, along with Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy (2014), collectively seek to ensure that, amongst other criteria, development is high quality and positively responds to site context and local character and reflect its form pattern and grain of development.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellant sets out that there was a lack of opportunity to amend or discuss the proposal with the Council, and I understand that the proposal has been amended from a previously refused scheme². However, this does not alter the conclusions I have reached regarding conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR

¹ Application reference 19/01768/FUL

² Application reference 21/01034/FUL