The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2015

**by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 16 July 2015**

**Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/15/3019497**
**6 Park Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire SO53 2EU**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Paul Watson against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application ref: F/14/75675, dated 27 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2015.
- The development proposed is construction of a 3 bay oak framed garage.

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a 3 bay oak framed garage at 6 Park Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire SO53 2EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/14/75675, dated 27 November 2014, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing no. PL001 'Proposed Structure', drawing no. 002 dated 27/10/1997, and drawing no. 3 dated 27/10/1997 'Trees/Hedges within falling distance of proposed development'.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. On the western side of this part of Park Road there are predominantly large detached dwellings of an individual design and finished in a range of materials. They are generally set-back discretely from the highway behind frontage trees and landscaping. Many are significantly larger than those dwellings on the opposite side of the road and sit within much larger plots. No. 6 Park Road is a particularly substantial detached property, which sits back from the highway

within an extensive plot. Other than a short gap for its access, it has tall hedgerows and mature trees along the front boundary.

4. The proposed garage would be set forward of the house, roughly between its front elevation and the highway, albeit offset to the side. Whilst that forward siting would be generally at odds with the significant set-back of most nearby buildings on this side of the road, given the very significant screening provided by trees and other landscaping, the building would not be prominent in the streetscene. I have no reason to believe that significant areas of landscaping would be removed, and I note that some of the trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

5. The proposed garage would be relatively plain and would have a half-hipped roof. It would be much smaller and lower than the host property, and its style and appearance would contrast with the more ornate detailing and period features on that building. However, in my view, that approach would be appropriate as, notwithstanding its forward siting, the proposal's simple appearance, scale, open bays, and wood finish would allow the host building to dominate.

6. Whilst I have considered the consented double garage which is set back from the highway to the side of no. 6, given the size of the host dwelling, and the size and context of the plot, this proposal would not harm the area even when considered alongside that development.

7. For the above reasons the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and would not conflict with that requirement of policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 (2006) ('LPR'). Although the Council referred in its decision to the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, as that document has not been adopted, it significantly limits the weight I attach to its policies. I note in any event that policy DM1's requirement that development should not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area, is broadly similar to the LPR policy.

**Conditions and conclusion**

8. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard time limit condition, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

9. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring the external surfaces to match those in the existing building. However, by reference to the application form and drawings, this scheme would be faced with treated softwood timber and cedar shingles. For the reasons set out above, and given the range of materials in the area, I consider those details to be acceptable. I have therefore not imposed the suggested condition. For the above reasons, the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

*Chris Couper*

INSPECTOR