



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/25/3360894

9 Broad Leaze Patchway South Gloucestershire BS34 5GW

- 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 Janice Chui Man Lau against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02771/HH.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of the garage into habitable space for carer adaptation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of the garage into habitable space for carer adaptation at 9 Broad Leaze, Patchway South Gloucestershire BS34 5GW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P24/02771/HH, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 9/BL/P/02/P; 9/BL/P/03/P; 9/BL/P/04/P; 9/BL/P/06/P.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development used by the Council differs from that appearing in the planning application. The description on the application form is specific to the appellant's intentions and I have used this, reasoning accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The Main Issue is the effect of the development on the adequacy of residential parking.

Reasons

4. The appeal site (No.9) is a detached two-storey house within a recent development of similar housing served by shared-surface¹ access roads. The shared surface area immediately to the front of No.9 and its five neighbouring houses provides

¹ Meaning that there are no formal or continuous footpaths adjacent to the road surfaces.

opportunities for on-street parking of some 6 cars without obstruction. Most of these were vacant at the time of my site visit.

5. The proposed development would convert and extend the existing side garage to form a caring suite for a member of the household at No.9. The dwelling currently has two full-sized parking spaces in addition to the garage which is of sufficient size to be regarded as a parking space according to Policy PSP16 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (Adopted 2017) (SGLP), resulting in an existing provision of 3 suitably-sized parking spaces. Policy PSP16 of the SGLP requires that No.9, as a four-bedroom dwelling, should currently be provided with two parking spaces. Consequently, the house is parking compliant at the moment without the use of the garage.
6. The proposed insertion of an access ramp to the converted garage would explain the Council's suggestion that there would be only one useable parking space on site due to the loss of the garage and the space to its front being obstructed. My assessment of the level difference to be addressed by a ramp is such that what appears on the plans submitted is significantly larger than necessary for an acceptable slope and that this, in itself, would not prevent the use of the space for parking. Bearing in mind that the submitted plan indicates the additional accommodation would be integral to the main dwelling and not be accessed only by the ramp (other than, perhaps, by a visiting carer), and although the parking area has an existing width of 3.1m (which would not accord with usual standards where persons of limited mobility are concerned but ample for an able-bodied person) I consider there is sufficient flexibility in terms of opportunities for passenger unloading in this quiet street (or for temporary on-street parking) to allow direct access to the extension when required, and also retain use of the parking space.
7. The Council suggest the additional accommodation would increase demand for parking, including from a visiting carer. Whilst adequate parking provision is an essential component of successful residential development and PSP16 sets a requirement of 3 spaces for the resulting five-bedroomed house, it is also clear that the existing household would have visitors (including carers) with or without the development proposed and that the dwelling could not readily be adapted to provide these facilities without extension. It is not indicated that the accommodation is needed for an enlarged household or that the accommodation would necessarily be retained as sleeping accommodation in the long term.
8. Whilst the proposal would conflict to a minor degree with the strict application of Policy PSP16, I have not found that planning harm arises from this conflict. Significant weight should be attached to the benefit of enabling members of an existing household to remain in their own home. This benefit outweighs the concerns raised by the Council that is, as my reasoning sets out, likely to have a very small, potentially insignificant, impact on the availability of parking and the use of the shared-surface highway. In this case, the material considerations I have identified strongly indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the Development Plan such that, with all matters raised taken into account, the appeal should succeed subject to the usual plans and timing conditions.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR