The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2013

by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc, Dip HistCons, Dip UD, MRTPI, IHBC

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

Decision date: 25 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/13/2196425
22 Thornbury Wood, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO53 5DQ

- 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 Dr and Mrs Waddington against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/13/71896, dated 20 December 2012, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2013.
- The development proposed is for a first floor side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to a two storey detached house with an off set projecting single storey garage. It is set back from the road, behind a substantial frontage. It is located within a residential estate.

4. The character and appearance of the locality is defined by detached two storey houses set within a low density layout. Although there is some variation in the design of the houses and their siting within the plots, the general use of brick and tile gives a sense of cohesion to the locality. Mature planting and trees, together with deep, open and often grassed frontages, give the estate a verdant and spacious feel. Whilst the spaces between neighbouring properties vary, the majority are set off the common boundaries and additional gaps are generally above a single storey element on one side. These provide a sense of space and views of the mature trees and planting behind. They add to the spacious and verdant feel of the street scene and the locality. The appeal site contributes to this character and appearance.

5. On my site visit, I noted a minority of houses that have side extensions which have diminished the space between the properties. However, the general character and appearance of the locality as outlined above remains.

6. Although the appeal site is covered by Tree Preservation Orders No 2 and No 260, as there are no trees close to the proposed development, no harm would arise in this respect. However, even though the design of the proposed extension would relate satisfactorily to the host dwelling, it would significantly

diminish the gap between the appeal property and its neighbour, whatever the exact measurement would be. The fact that it would be generally in line with the two storey element of No 20 adds to this concern. It would reduce the views of the trees and planting beyond and erode the spacious qualities of the layout. It would adversely affect the street scene and the character and appearance of the locality. This would be the case, even though the impact of the proposal may be reduced in longer range views by the curve in the road, the slightly different siting of some of the properties in relation to one another, and mature trees in the street and the private gardens.

7. I have assessed the other developments brought to my attention but none replicate the circumstances of this appeal in terms of the extension or the proposed extension, its relationship to the host dwelling, its neighbours, the street and its effect on the spacious qualities of the locality.

8. I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locality and would fail to accord with saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011. This requires development proposals to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. I find this policy generally consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

9. It would also be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 Pre-Submission Consultation, which has a similar aim. However, the fact that this policy is at a relatively early stage of preparation limits the weight that I accord it in coming to my decision.

10. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions, but in this case they would fail to overcome the unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locality that I have identified. In coming to my decision, I have also had particular regard to section 7 of the Framework.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR