
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3372041

35 Robbins Close, Bradley Stoke, Bristol, South Gloucestershire, BS32 8AS

- 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 Leo Chalk against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/01558/HH.
 - The development proposed is two sided car port to be placed in front garden...
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Amended plans have been submitted by the appellant. As the plans differ and provide more information from the original proposal, I differ and provide more information from the original proposal, I consider acceptance of these plans would be prejudiced towards the Council and third parties who have not had the opportunity to comment on this revision. I will therefore not be considering these amended plans in making my recommendation.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and host building; the living conditions of the occupiers of No.35 Robbins Close, with particular regard to light; and the impact on highway safety, with particular regard to parking provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property sits at the turning point end of a residential cul-de-sac featuring housing set back from the highway by front gardens and driveways. Except for small ancillary bin stores, the front gardens and driveways are free from development, contributing to a spacious feel to the cul-de-sac despite the narrow highway.
5. The design of the housing throughout the cul-de-sac is not uniform, however is brought together through a consistent use of red and buff brick under a tile roof with the provision of porches to the front elevation. Timber cladding is used as a secondary material on some dwellings.
6. The appeal property does not front directly onto the cul-de-sac highway as with other dwellings in the surrounding area. However, the front elevation of the appeal

property remains clearly visible from the turning point of the cul-de-sac, with a front garden sited between the highway and dwelling, reinforcing the spacious characteristics of the area.

7. The proposal, by means of its prominent location forward of the host dwelling, would result in a disruption to the currently unrestricted view from the highway to the dwelling. The height and scale of the car port combined with its prominent location would erode the open feel of area harming both character of the area and host dwelling.
8. Although the choice of materials would be similar to that used in nearby buildings, the proposed car port would be an prominent and discordant feature along the street scene and would detract from the existing pattern of development, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the above reasons, the proposal would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and host property. It is therefore contrary to Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2027) (SGLP), Policy PSP1 and Policy PSP38 of South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (November 2017) (SGPSP) which, when taken together, seeks to ensure development is informed by and respects the characteristics of the site and its context.

Living Conditions

10. The front elevation and front garden of the appeal property face a northerly direction. The front elevation constitutes of a front porch with the ground floor front room's window set slightly back. This front window currently has an unrestricted view of the front garden towards the hedge line that delineates the boundary between the appeal property and the highway Baileys Court Road.
11. The proposed car port would be situated directly in front of the front room window, blocking the outlook of the room and creating an enclosed effect. The appellant has highlighted that the room is north facing so that direct sunlight would not be blocked as a result. However, due to the height, depth and timber clad walls combined with its location directly in front of the living room window the proposal would have an enclosing effect that would result in restricted daylight in to the room which it serves, creating and duly gloomy effect. This would result in harm to the users of the room and would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No.35.
12. By way of the car port reducing the level of daylight into the appeal property, the proposal would harm the living conditions of No.35 and would conflict with SGSPSP Policy PSP8 which seeks to ensure development will not have unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of occupiers of the development, as well as nearby properties.

Highway Safety

13. Parking provision along the cul-de-sac is currently through a combination of driveway and on-street parking. There are no markings along the highway along with no clear delineation between the highway and pedestrianised areas. At the time of my site visit, vehicles were parked at various locations along the highway,

often over the pavement resulting in pedestrians being required to walk within the highway.

14. A turning point is located at the end of the cul-de-sac, in front of the appeal property. At the time of my site visit, this was also used for the parking of vehicles, restricting the space available for turning.
15. The proposed car port would be located on an area currently used for the parking of two cars. Due to its central location, over both parking spaces for 35 Robins Close, the proposal would decrease the number of parking spaces from three to two. With reduced parking provision, this would increase the pressure on the on-street parking by increasing the number of vehicles required to use the highway. This would have a harmful effect on the highway where on-street parking provision is already limited and under pressure, as evidenced by the use of the turning point.
16. In decreasing the private parking provision of No.35 and increasing the pressure on parking on Robbins Close, this is therefore in conflict with the parking standards of SGPS Policies PSP16 and PSP38 which seek to ensure development does not prejudice highway safety or the provision of an acceptable level of parking.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR

