



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

by D Wilson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/24/3346443

54 Queens Drive, Hanham, South Gloucestershire BS15 3JL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kevin Head against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/00297/F.
 - The development proposed is convert the existing garage and workshop incidental to 54 Queens Drive and connect it via an internal door to the existing approved annexe ancillary to the main dwelling (54a) to provide a new living room, double bedroom, shower room and home office and to create a dwelling separate from the ownership of No.54 Queens Drive; replacement of the existing roller shutter door with a new insulated and rendered cavity wall and composite front door; replacement of the rear window in the garage with new French doors to the garden area to the west.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. On submission of the appeal scheme the appellant provided amended plans reference: Site context Plan showing Dry Main for Fire Fighting Drawing No 08 and Swept Path for an Ambulance Drawing No 09. The amended plans have sought to provide clarification on fire fighting facilities and ambulance turning space. The amended plans were available when the appeal was submitted, and the Council had the opportunity to comment. The amended plans provide clarity rather than any significant changes to the proposed scheme. Accordingly, no one would be prejudiced were my decision to have had regard to the amended plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area,
 - the effect of the proposed development on highway safety in respect of access, and
 - whether accessible and convenient storage for waste would be provided.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located to the rear of No 54 Queens Drive and is accessed by a lane that also provides access to some neighbouring garages. There is an existing garage and workshop on the appeal site, which is currently partly being used as an annex ancillary to No 54, no changes are proposed to the size of the existing building.
5. Queens drive is a predominantly residential area which is categorised by mostly bungalows which follow a similar building line. The similar design and position of the dwellings within Queens Drive results in uniformity within the street scene, which is also replicated on the adjacent road, Kings Drive.
6. The appeal building currently forms a line of garages which are subordinate to their associated dwellings. While no increase in built form is proposed, the use as a separate dwelling would differ from that of a garage, workshop and annex which would have a reliance on the main dwelling at No 54.
7. The proposed internal changes would result in an additional bedroom which could allow for an increase in the number of occupants of the dwelling which would intensify the previous use. All movements to and from the dwelling would be via the lane which would differ from the previous situation. This, combined with the changes through domestic paraphernalia and parking would highlight the change and result in an obvious line of development behind Queens Drive which would erode the uniformity that forms the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2027 (CS) and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development respects and enhances the character and distinctiveness of both the site and its context.

Highway safety

9. The proposed dwelling would be accessed by a narrow track that is currently unmade. Policy PSP11 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan Adopted November 2017 (LP) requires that unobstructed emergency vehicle access is provided.
10. The access and track are narrow; however, it would be wide enough for an emergency vehicle to gain access to the proposed dwelling. I also note that the appellant has provided a swept path analysis that demonstrates that an ambulance could turn around within the site in five manoeuvres. However, this is on the basis that the space to the front of the dwelling is clear and I am mindful that two parking spaces are to be provided as well as waste storage and therefore while emergency access may be rarely needed, when it is needed the appeal site is unlikely to be empty and the limited space would make it difficult for an emergency vehicle to manoeuvre.
11. I therefore conclude that it has not been demonstrated that safe access for emergency vehicles would be possible and as such, the proposal would unacceptably harm highway safety and would be contrary to Policy PSP11 of

the LP and Paragraph 114 of the Framework which amongst other things, seek to ensure safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

Storage for waste

12. Policy CS1 of the CS requires that sufficient space provision is designed in for the sorting and storage of recyclable waste as well of the collection of these. The storage of waste is shown to the front of the dwelling; however, the collection of the waste from Queens Drive would require dragging the bins for a considerable distance which would be contrary to guidance contained within the Council's Waste and recycling collection: guidance for new development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which requires a distance of less than 25m.
13. I note that the existing annex has been occupied for some time, and occupiers have taken their waste to Queens Drive without any problems. However, I must have regard to future occupiers of the proposed dwelling who would be inconvenienced by the distance and particularly those with mobility issues who may struggle to transport the bins the distance required for collection.
14. I therefore conclude that it has not been demonstrated that accessible and convenient storage for waste would be provided. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS1 of the CS and guidance contained within the SPD.

Other Matters

15. The appellant states that the Council's locational Policy is out of date; however, as the Council have found that the siting of the proposed dwelling within the urban area of Hanham would be acceptable the locational Policies are not the most important in determining the scheme and therefore Paragraph 11 of the Framework is not engaged.
16. The appellant has referred to properties across South Gloucestershire and wider afield that have long driveways and gates in order to justify the distance future occupiers would need to transport their bins in an attempt to justify the appeal proposal. I have not been provided any details in respect of such properties so I cannot be sure of the circumstances of these. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits, based on the evidence before me.
17. The Council have found that the proposed dwelling would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers and would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, these are neutral matters that do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
18. The proposal would result in an additional dwelling which attracts some weight in favour of the proposal; however, this is tempered by the fact the proposal only relates to one dwelling so only attracts limited weight in favour that does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Wilson INSPECTOR