



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2025

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/24/3355453

5 Adams Land, Coalpit Heath, Bristol South Gloucestershire BS36 2JT

- 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 Steven Griffin-Santos against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/01568/F.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of land from parking area to residential amenity land. Installation of one garage door to front elevation. Demolish the rear garden wall between the garden and the driveway. Install closed boarded fence on the rear driveway boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of land from parking area to residential amenity land. Installation of one garage door to front elevation. Demolish the rear garden wall between the garden and the driveway. Install closed boarded fence on the rear driveway boundary at 5 Adams Land, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS36 2JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P24/01568/F, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos - Site Location Plan (A01-1 Rev A), Block Plan (A01-2 Rev A), Proposed Site Plan (A03-1 Rev A), Proposed Elevations A03-2 Rev A).

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development 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 issues in this case are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The application site consists of an end of terrace dwelling located on a corner of a highway. A generally similar form, scale and materials used for the dwellings within the cul de sac contributes positively to its unified and coherent character.
5. The end of terrace units have attached garage spaces, facing the frontage. The proposed installation of a garage door to the frontage would sit comfortably in this wider context and would match and balance the other end of terrace property in the row. Whilst this would result in the single storey garage projection having a garage door on its front and rear, this would not be seen from any one viewpoint and would not appear incongruous.
6. Whilst brick walls are common to the surroundings, there are visible rear and side boundary timber fences, in addition to a lengthy timber fence sat in close proximity to the highway at the entrance to the cul de sac, visible from the appeal site. As such, timber fencing sits as part of the established character of the surrounding area and boundary treatment in general contributes little to the coherent character of the wider development.
7. The proposed timber boundary treatment would not therefore appear out of keeping with the surrounding area nor be a discordant addition to the street scene.
8. Whilst extending closer to the highway than the existing boundary wall, it would still sit back from the highway behind the remaining parking space and building line formed by the garage projection. It would therefore not compromise the existing mixture of density and space and general design qualities within the surroundings, and would not appear as a cramped development.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or surrounding area. There is therefore no conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) or the advice set out in the supplementary planning document 'Householder Design Guide' (2021) which require development to be high-quality in terms of design.

Highway Safety

10. I observed that the frontage of the property is already used as a parking space, and a dropped kerb allows access to this area. Whilst this space sits in close proximity to the corner of the highway as it turns, there is no substantive evidence before me that the existing use of this space for parking causes any highway safety issues. In addition, I observed that drivers naturally slow when approaching the corner. Such an arrangement would also not be wholly unanticipated given the residential character of the road and number of similar parking spaces along Adams Land, including the existing space to No 6 at the rear of the appeal site.
11. Whilst the user of the remaining parking space serving the adjoining property would no longer be able to manoeuvre across the space of the appeal site, should this parking space be occupied at present, this would also not be possible. The access to the retained rear parking space of No 6 would not otherwise be changed, and the manoeuvring required and ability to access this space would be unaffected.

12. Again, there is no substantive evidence before me that this existing arrangement leads to highway safety issues. The adjacent pedestrian access to the rear of the garden areas would remain and the corner of the timber boundary fence would not impede visibility to any great extent. As such, I find that the proposal would not harm highway safety. The proposal would not therefore conflict with the provision of safe access and highway safety goals of Policy PSP11 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Place Plan (2017).

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

14. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR