The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2011

by Brian Cook BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 October 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/11/2160026
31 Park Road, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire SO53 2EW

- 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 David Ryan against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/11/68818, dated 14 March 2011, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2011.
- The development proposed is alterations and extensions to (*illegible*) to create new garage and car port, enlarged living room, conservatory, WC at ground floor. New accommodation at roof level with new bedroom, stairs and shower room. Modifications to drive to provide area of porous block paving.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The Council describes the proposal more simply as 'alterations and extension to create a 2-storey dwelling with front dormer, rear conservatory and attached garage/carport and single-storey detached workshop at rear'. This appears to have been broadly accepted by the appellant and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

3. Five plans have been submitted with the appeal documentation (11:009:01 RevA; 11:009:02; 11:009:03 RevB; 11:009:04 RevB and 11:009:05 RevB). All are date-stamped by the Council 29 March 2011 and endorsed with the application reference number. A further plan, 11:009:01 RevB, is on the file but this is not stamped or marked in any way by the Council. The date it is said to be plotted is 7 September 2011, well after the Council determined the application that is before me. As it could not have formed part of the Council's consideration and there is no explanation for it being on the file, I have not taken it into account in reaching my decision.

Reasons

4. While the dwellings on Park Road as a whole exhibit a range of designs and age of construction, in the block formed by Park Road and Kings Road the buildings are predominantly detached bungalows with simple hipped or pyramidal roofs like that of the appeal property. While some have been subject to alteration, the essence of the design is unchanged and, together with the spaces between the buildings, contributes to the character and appearance of the area and the street scene as it is perceived when travelling and walking along these roads.

Furthermore, given the orientation of Kings Road to Park Road the rear of the appeal property can be viewed to some extent from the public domain.

5. The appeal property lies within rather than on the edge of this block of buildings and therefore reads very much as a part of its character and appearance. The appeal proposal would create a dwelling of atypically asymmetrical design when viewed from Park Road and this asymmetry would also be perceived when viewed from Kings Road. More importantly, the considerable expanse of largely unrelieved roof slope to both side elevations and, to a lesser degree, the front elevation would create an obtrusive and dominant feature in the street scene not apparent on any other building in the near vicinity. These discordant features and the closing of the gap between the appeal property and the adjoining dwelling that would result from building above a new garage where the car port now is would harm the character and appearance of the area and appear somewhat incongruous in the street scene.

6. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), adopted in May 2006. This policy seeks to promote good design, was saved by a Direction of the Secretary of State dated 14 May 2009 and continues to have effect. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Brian Cook

Inspector