



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2025

by **S Edwards BA MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/25/3365506

88 Gays Road, Hanham, South Gloucestershire BS15 3JX

- 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 Hallett against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
- The application Ref is P25/00446/F.
- The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of existing attached garage and erection of 1no. attached dwelling with associated works'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's draft Local Plan (2026-2040) is at a relatively early stage of preparation and there is no certainty that it will be adopted in its current form. I can therefore only attribute very limited weight to its policies.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of the existing and proposed dwellings, with particular regard to outdoor amenity space and cycle storage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site lies within an established residential estate predominantly characterised by a mixture of semi-detached and terraced properties of a broadly similar style. The site comprises a semi-detached house with an attached garage set within a prominently sited triangular shaped plot. The proposed dwelling would be of a similar built form to a two-storey side extension and a single storey side extension, which have recently been granted planning permission¹ by the Council. The design of the proposed built form has sought to remain subservient to the existing dwelling and is in isolation not objectionable.
5. However, compared with a side extension, the effect that the appeal scheme would have on the character and appearance of this residential estate would be

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference P24/02081/HH.

quite different. By reason of the small size of the dwelling and the plot, the proposal would appear at odds with the prevailing pattern of development which characterises the surrounding area. Rather than appearing as a side extension to the existing dwelling, the intensification of development resulting from the severance of the site into two distinct plots and creation of a separate residential property would be evident, for example through the introduction of additional forms of fencing or boundary treatment. Any garden paraphernalia to the side of the new house in what is already a fairly confined area and close to the road would bring a cluttered appearance to the plot, which would harmfully contrast with the suburban character of the locality.

6. Given the above, the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with the design aims of Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy – adopted December 2013 (CS), Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan – adopted November 2017 (PSPP). Amongst other things, these require development proposals to be informed by, respect and enhance the character, distinctiveness and amenity of both the site and its context.
7. The Council's reasons for refusal also make reference to the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted March 2021), but this is considered of little relevance to the proposed residential development scheme.

Living conditions

8. Policy PSP43 of the PSPP sets out private and communal external amenity space standards for residential units and makes it clear that it should be functional and safe, easily accessible from living areas, orientated to maximise sunlight, of a sufficient size and functional shape to meet the needs of the likely number of occupiers and designed to take account of the context of the development. The supporting text to Policy PSP43 sets out the Council's expectations in terms of what external amenity space should include, as a minimum, to demonstrate its usability.
9. As detailed in paragraph 8.69, higher density development may be appropriate in certain locations and circumstances, in which case the standards are expected to be relaxed. However, I have been presented with little evidence to demonstrate that the appeal scheme meets such circumstances and justifies a relaxation of the standards.
10. The subdivision of the plot and the proposed built form would leave very limited space for the provision of usable private amenity areas, both for the existing and the proposed dwellings. Whilst the third bedroom of the existing dwelling is modest in size, there is no doubt that by reason of its layout, the property could legitimately provide accommodation for a small family and should therefore be provided with outdoor garden space that is commensurate to the needs of its occupiers.
11. However, due to the constrained shape and size of the plot, the existing three-bedroom dwelling would only be left with a very small rear garden area, which would fall significantly short of the requirements set by Policy PSP43 for this type of property. The outdoor amenity space would not be large enough to accommodate an external seating area and typical domestic paraphernalia such as children's play equipment, a washing line, bins, etc.

12. The external amenity space would also not be large enough to accommodate a garden shed for general storage and/or for the provision of secure and covered cycle parking, required due to the loss of the garage which forms part of the proposed development. Given that the area to the front of the existing dwelling is required for the provision of car parking, I fail to see how this space could also be used for soft landscaping, refuse and recycling storage and for growing plants. For these reasons, the size of the outdoor amenity space would be wholly inadequate for the existing three-bedroom house. Whilst the lack of secure cycle storage would not in isolation justify the refusal of planning permission, it does compound other issues associated with the proposal.
13. The outdoor amenity space for the proposed house would be similarly poor, due to its constrained shape and size. The area to the rear of the new dwelling would not be large enough to accommodate more than a table and chairs. The remaining areas to the side and front of the proposed dwelling would be of a more incidental nature and would not adequately compensate for the limited provision of outdoor amenity space, particularly when accounting for the provision of secure cycle storage, as required by Policy PSP16 of the PSPP. Accordingly, it is my view that the matter could not be overcome by a condition requiring details of secure cycle storage.
14. Limited information has been presented regarding the proposed planting along the site's frontage and due to its largely open nature, it is highly unlikely that future occupiers would find this a comfortable or enjoyable area to use as private amenity space. Although the appeal scheme would overall comply with the minimum amenity space standards for one-bedroom houses, the area as a whole would not be private and functional and would not, consequently, meet the needs of the likely number of occupiers.
15. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for both the occupiers of the existing and proposed dwellings, with particular regard to outdoor amenity space and cycle storage. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies PSP16, PSP38 and PSP43 of the PSPP which notably expect residential units to have access to private amenity space and set cycle parking standards.

Other Matters

16. The Council is presently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The presented evidence reveals that the Council only has 4.41 years of supply, which does not represent a significant shortfall. Nevertheless, in such circumstances, paragraph 11 d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that planning permission should be granted, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. The paragraph adds that particular regard should be given to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed spaces and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
17. The appeal site lies within the urban settlement boundary of Hanham and within the North and East Fringes of Bristol urban area where, as set out in CS Policy CS5, most new development is expected to take place. The appeal

scheme would therefore be sited in a relatively accessible location and also make a small contribution to the housing supply in the area. Furthermore, it would enable the construction of a one-bedroom property, a type of dwelling that is underrepresented in the area, and for which a need has been identified within the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Together with the other social and economic advantages associated with the construction of a dwellinghouse, the overall benefits of the scheme would be modest.

18. Against that, I have found that the appeal proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, and fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of the existing and proposed dwellings. As a result, the appeal scheme would not meet the aim of securing well-designed places or make effective use of land. These are major objections weighing heavily against the proposed development.
19. Overall, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission for the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with the development, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole and having particular regard to key policies. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

20. The appeal scheme would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above, the proposal is unacceptable and I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR