



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3359564

12 Long Beach Road Longwell Green Bristol BS30 9UJ

- 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 Wetten against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02527/HH.
 - The development proposed is Garden room office / studio.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council have raised three reasons for refusal (RFR) all referring to Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (SGLP) which seeks to define the acceptability of development within residential curtilages according to four criteria. RFR 1 & 2, also refer to Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (Adopted) December 2013 (Core Strategy) seeking High Quality Design, in which regard the Council's Annex and Residential Outbuildings Guidance SPD (SPD) is relevant. I therefore consider the main issue in this matter as follows:

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed garden room/home office would be of a scale and design to be sufficiently subordinate to the host dwelling, leave adequate amenity space and accord with the principles of high-quality design set out in the development plan including its related guidance.

Reasons

4. The proposal intends an L-shaped single-storey outbuilding, described as a home office/studio, within the rear garden area of the appeal site (No.12) which is a semi-detached house in an established residential area where many rear gardens are typically found with modestly-sized outbuildings. The proposal would replace the existing garage with a single, much larger building, which would occupy around half of the rear garden area, resulting in limited external amenity space¹.

¹ According to the Council this would be less than 40m² against a requirement of 60m² for a three-bedroom house.

5. Although the plot in which No.12 sits is of a good size, the disposition of the host dwelling within the site, which is set back from the main road with a wide gravelled parking area to the side leading to the existing deeply inset garage, generates an awkward and restricted configuration of outdoor space. This is further hampered by a lowered patio area associated with the rear conservatory. Whilst a limited amenity area, particularly if south-facing as is the case here, may be acceptable to some households, the effect of the proposal would be to tightly enclose and dominate the remaining amenity area and also to reduce the perceived depth of the garden due to its unbroken form and bulk. This would be uncharacteristic of what is found in the surrounding area.
6. The proposal, by virtue of its mass and size would both dominate the host dwelling and impair its amenity space, extending along a significant proportion of the side boundaries and the entire rear boundary. The Annex and Residential Outbuildings Guidance SPD (SPD) points to the importance of subservience, retaining a substantial proportion of the garden and being insufficiently sized for use as an independent dwelling. The proposal fails in all of these requirements.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed outbuilding would conflict with Policies PSP38 (4) of the SGLP and PSP1 of the Core Strategy which, taken together, require outbuildings to be subservient and of high-quality design, reflecting the guidance set out in the SPD.

Other Matters

8. The appellant suggests that the proposed outbuilding would be 'permitted development', meaning what is provided by Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO). The appellant also states that he was not invited to amend the proposal. However, this appeal may only consider what has been submitted; nor do I have information before me sufficient to consider a potential 'fallback' argument in relation to the provisions of the GPDO.
9. I therefore conclude, having taken all matters raised into account, that the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the development plan in the way my reasoning explains and that, in consequence, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR