



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2025

by **Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/24/3357774

4 Woodhouse Close, Almondsbury BS32 4HX

- 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 R Zoku against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/01658/F.
 - The development proposed is described as “proposed detached dwelling”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of the proposed dwelling and 5a Woodhouse Close (No 5a) in terms of light and outlook; and whether the proposal contributes towards biodiversity net gain.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by semi-detached and linked residential properties. There are a number of extensions and other buildings associated with the existing properties in the area, nevertheless, the buildings have substantial gaps between each other. It is this consistent built form with spacious gaps that contributes positively to the character of the area.
4. The proposal would introduce an incongruous structure between existing buildings that would result in the loss of a spacious gap. The proposed property, given its size, design and proximity to existing buildings, would be a dominant structure that detracts from the existing pattern of development and would be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene.
5. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS5 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan which seeks development to have high quality design and be of an appropriate scale.

Living conditions

6. The proposed property would be set forward of the building line of No 5a. The proposal would appear as a large expanse of built development when viewed from

the front windows of No 5a. This would have an oppressive effect on the living conditions of occupants of the rooms to the front of No 5a. Given the orientation of the properties and the position of the proposal, there would be a significant loss of light to the front windows of No 5a, particularly later in the day when the sun moves west.

7. Due to the position, orientation and proximity of the proposal in relation to No 5a and 4 Woodhouse Close (No 4), the outlook from the proposed front and rear windows would be compromised by the gable elevations of Nos 4 and 5a, therefore having an adverse effect on living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed development.
8. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of No 5 and the proposed dwelling. The proposed development would not accord with Policies PSP8 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan which seeks development to not prejudice the amenities of neighbours and ensure there are no unacceptable impacts resulting from loss of light and, overbearing and dominant impacts.

Biodiversity net gain

9. The appellant has indicated that the proposed scheme is exempt from biodiversity net gain as he is a builder with the intention being that this is to be a self-build scheme that he would reside in. The appellant states that he is willing to formalise this in a legal agreement, however, no such agreement has been submitted with this appeal. This matter does not alter my findings on the other main issues.

Other Matters

10. Photographs of Nos 4 and 5a have been submitted which show garage and extension on the boundary. The garage and extension are single storey structures which are not directly comparable to the proposed two storey dwelling.
11. My attention has been drawn to planning permissions P22/03898/F and P20/15540/F, as well as associated photographs. There is minimal compelling evidence before me on these matters and I do not consider that they are directly comparable to the appeal scheme, particularly with regards to location and effects on surrounding area. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
12. The appellant notes that he is in ownership of 4, 5a and 5 Woodhouse Close and also notes that the Council's proactive statement is misleading with there being frustrations around communication. These matters do not alter the harm I have found with regards to the main issues.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweighs this finding.
14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR