



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2024

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/D/23/3334614

21 Ashton Close Gloucester GL4 5BP

- 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 Woodhouse against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/00741/FUL dated 8 September 2023 was refused by notice dated 23 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is proposed single storey extension & conversion of existing garage .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would be afforded safe and suitable access.

Reasons

3. The appeal site (No.21) is located within a late-twentieth-century development of two-storey family housing and it seems that many of the properties were originally built with an integral garage and single off-road parking space in tandem or other configurations of garaging and parking with similar levels of provision. A combination of factors including the tight, dense layout, proliferation of private vehicles and a tendency for garages not to be used for day-to-day parking has resulted in an environment dominated by cars and hard paving with only residues of greenery to frontages. No.21 sits adjacent to a relatively congested corner grouping of 3 houses with which it shares an access over a single length of dropped kerb. My site visit took place after the end of the working day during which it became apparent that there is significant pressure on the limited on-road parking opportunities and this arises in part from residential overflow and the high proportion of frontage occupied by pavement crossings/dropped kerbs.
4. The proposal would absorb the existing garage into residential accommodation and extend that built form over part of the parking space leaving an area roughly¹ 7m wide and 4m deep between the footway and the front wall of the house as proposed to be extended. The appellant provides images which show two vehicles can be parked off road but in a diagonal layout. However, this conflicts with block plans² provided which attempt to show that the front

¹ The appellant has provided no scaled plan or dimension so these are estimated distances which may be inaccurate.

² 21AC PKW G-003

extension would still allow perpendicular parking for two vehicles. These plans, both lack dimensions and are at an unsuitably small scale which does not allow for effective scaling such that the parking arrangements cannot be properly assessed. The submitted plans are, therefore, unconvincing as to the potential to park standard vehicles perpendicular to (and without overhanging) the footway.

5. Further, the proposed 'diagonal' parking appearing in the appellant statement appears to indicate that the vehicles shown could require access over land which is neither within the area intended to be controlled by the permission sought ('red line plan') nor defined as highway/pavement crossing. Whilst it may be that the appellant has rights which would allow such a manoeuvre over adjacent block paving³, that has not been demonstrated. Consequently, even if the appeal were capable of being determined in favour of the appellant based on the submission that the frontage can conveniently accommodate suitably sized spaces, there is insufficient clarity in terms of drawn information to demonstrate how that can be achieved. Awkward, multiple or potentially dangerous vehicle movements would likely result in frequent displacement of household vehicles onto the already congested highway.
6. The Council refer to multiple policies, many of which are not directly relevant to the matter to be determined including out-of-date versions of the National Planning Policy Framework. Nevertheless, for the reasons I set out the proposal would conflict with Policies A1(3) and A9(1) of the Gloucester City Plan (2011-2031) (GCP) which seek to ensure extensions to dwellings do not result in a cramped or overdeveloped site and provide adequate off-street parking. I therefore conclude the development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and therefore, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

³ Noting the differing colours of paving.