



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/25/3361424

41 Jekyll Close Stoke Park Stoke Gifford South Gloucestershire BS16 1UX

- 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 Optimal Property Management Ltd against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02553/HH.
 - The development proposed is Conversion of existing garage to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council have raised three reasons for refusal (RFR). RFR 1 relates to the adequacy of information and some inconsistency in the drawings provided. I am satisfied that these concerns are clarified by the appellant's submission and that in consequence, the main issues arise from the remaining RFR as follows:

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) whether the development would be afforded an adequate provision of car parking and (ii) the impact of the proposal upon use of cycles as an alternative to private vehicles.

Reasons

4. The appeal site (No.41) is located within a large, shared courtyard of similar housing provided with integral garaging and, unusually for dwellinghouses of the modern era, lacking private outdoor amenity space. Such housing is likely to be less attractive to families than other types of residential occupancy, such as shared/multiple occupation (HMO). The proposal concerns a three-storey townhouse, which includes a small parking area to the front of the garage and an adjacent non-paved surface, which together provide space for two cars. The appellant explains that the house is in use as an HMO and would, as a result of the proposed conversion, comprise 6 bedrooms.

5. Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (SGLP) requires that development within residential curtilages should not prejudice the provision of an acceptable amount of parking. Policy PSP16 sets out the requirement for on-site parking provision and secure, covered cycle parking spaces. The appellant points to the proximity of public transport and suggests that students do not usually own cars and that most secure cycle storage is 'usually within any dwelling in an HMO scenario'. However, the internal layout of the house is such that cycle storage within the entrance/hallway area is not practicable. The garage proposed to be converted is the only secure location suitable for keeping more than a single cycle. I therefore consider the concerns raised by RFR3 to be well-founded and in conflict with Policy PSP16 of the SGLP.
6. Turning to car parking provision, the courtyard is private¹, relatively spacious and there were examples of tandem parking which did not appear to create problems for user manoeuvring and would thereby allow sufficient parking for use of No.41 as a large family house or an HMO in student use, given the circumstances of the location. The appellant, however, makes no suggestions as to mitigation of the loss of the garage as secure cycle storage, questioning the number of cycle spaces required. In the absence of any readily available alternative to the garage for secure cycle storage, irrespective of the number of cycles actually used², and given an expectation of continued HMO use and its occupation by students (who are the most likely users of cycles) this is a matter to which significant weight should be attached.
7. Overall, whilst the proposal would not unacceptably reduce the availability of car parking, in the circumstances of use described there would be an unacceptable loss of secure cycle storage which cannot be mitigated. This would not only conflict with the requirements in the SGLP but would undermine the promotion of sustainable transport modes set out in the Framework³ and local objectives for modal shift away from reliance on the private car.
8. 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

¹ It is signed to restrict non-resident car users

² Policy PSP16 of the SGLP sets at (3) a minimum of 1 secured under cover space per HMO bedroom.

³ Section 9