60 Chamberlayne Road, Eastleigh

Proposed First Floor Extension to Outbuilding

Appeal Statement

May 2017

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Site Location and Context	2
3.	Relevant Planning Policies	5
4.	Relevant Planning History	7
5.	Key Determining Issues	10
6.	Summary	16

MB Planning
Town Planning Consultancy

1. Introduction

1.1 This document has been prepared by MB Planning, on behalf of our client, Mr and Mrs Kerwood, the landowners of 60 Chamberlayne Road, Eastleigh. This document provides supporting justification to a development proposal for the creation of an additional storey of accommodation above the existing garage outbuilding to the rear of the site.

1.2 A planning application for the development as described above was submitted in February 2017. The application (Council reference F/17/80074), was refused on 7 April 2017 with the following reasons given:

(1) "*The resulting development proposed, by virtue of its height, size and scale would introduce a feature of unwelcome prominence within the existing street scene and would be at odds with the prevailing character of this section of Blenheim Road, to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, and Supplementary Planning Documents 'Quality Places' and 'Character Area Appraisals - Eastleigh'.*

(2) The resulting development proposed, by virtue of its height, size, scale and position of roof lights would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking/loss of privacy and visual intrusion, to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring properties, particularly No.58 Chamberlayne Road. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, and Supplementary Planning Document 'Quality Places'.

(3) The resulting development would result in a reduction of internal space to the existing garage which would not meet the Council's space standards to be considered as being sufficient for usable off-street parking. This would result in a loss of on-site parking which would increase pressure for on-street parking, to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to saved Policies 59.BE & 104.T of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policies DM1 & DM24 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, and Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Parking Standards'."

1.3 The remainder of this report seeks to examine the site location and context, relevant planning policies, and relevant planning history, before going on to assess the issues raised in the decision notice.

2. Site Location and Context

2.1 The application site consists of a semi-detached dwelling fronting Chamberlayne Road. The focus of the appeal is the land to the rear of the site, which lies adjacent to both a rear service road, and Blenheim Road to the immediate south.

2.2 The dwelling has an attractive frontage that complements the character of other dwellings along Chamberlayne Road, with noteworthy features comprising a bay window, and an arched open porch entrance. The front of the site is enclosed by a brick wall, and the dwelling is set back from the road by way of a front garden.

2.3 As a corner plot, the rear of the site has an active frontage to Blenheim Road. This area of the site is enclosed by a close-boarded fence approximately 1.8 metres in height. A single storey rear extension to the property is also visible from this aspect.

2.4 A large, single storey outbuilding currently resides at the rear of the site. The outbuilding was built relatively recently (2010), and provides a garage, with vehicular access to Blenheim Road.



View of the outbuilding to the rear of the site

2.5 The outbuilding is brick built and has a flat roof. The outbuilding forms part of both the northern and southern boundaries to the site (the outbuilding spans the width of the site), and also forms the entire eastern boundary to the site.

2.6 The site is located within an entirely residential context. There is relatively uniform character to the area, with dwellings being of similar architectural form, and plot sizes also being similar.

2.7 One of the main characteristics of the area is the prevalence of outbuildings to the rear of plots in the vicinity of the site. There are several examples of this visible from the service road to the rear of the site.



Above: View of outbuildings to the rear of Blenheim Road

Below: An example of a large outbuilding to the rear of a property on Chamberlayne Road in close proximity to the application site



2.8 Outbuildings are also prevalent in the wider area. One notable example is a large outbuilding a short distance to the north of the site at 65 Chamberlayne Road. This site is considered to be relevant due to the scale and form of outbuilding that has been permitted by the Council, together with the fact the site is a corner plot, with the outbuilding being highly visible from Factory Road to the immediate north.



Above: View of the outbuilding to the rear of 65 Chamberlayne Road (viewed from Factory Road)

3. Relevant Planning Policies

National Planning Policies

3.1 Given the scale of development, national planning policy guidance is not considered to be relevant to this application.

Local Planning Policies

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 (2006)

3.2 Although out of date, the Saved Policies within the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review remain the relevant local planning policy guidance. The emerging local plan (that will eventually replace the local plan review) is not set to be adopted until at least 2018. Accordingly, no weight can be given to any of the policies within any of the draft versions of the emerging local plan that have been publicised to date.

3.3 The proposals map accompanying the local plan identifies that the site lies within a defined urban area, with no constraints associated with the site or surroundings. The boundary of Eastleigh Town Centre lies a short distance to the east of the site.

3.4 The decision notice refers to local plan policy 59.BE. This policy provides general guidance on what constitutes good design, and lists a number of criteria that development proposals are required to comply with. Of the criteria listed in the policy, criteria (i) is of relevance. This criteria requires that development proposals:

- Take fully and proper account of the context of the site, including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood, and are appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, natural features and trees worthy of retention

3.5 Refusal reason 3 also refers to policy 104.T. This policy advises that planning permission will only be granted for appropriate development which provides adequate off-highway parking up to the maximum standard set out in respect of the accessibility of that development.

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 Revised Pre-Submission (2014)

3.6 The Council have referenced two policies within the Eastleigh Local Plan Revised Pre-Submission document (policies DM1 and DM24). This is despite this document being declared unsound by a Planning Inspector, and the Council having since abandoned this version of the Local Plan. Accordingly, we consider no weight can be given to these policies.

3.7 However, as the Council have made reference to this document and policies contained within, a review of the two policies mentioned in the decision notice is provided below:

- Policy DM1: A general policy requiring all development to comply with a range of criteria, including not having an unacceptable impact on residential amenities, the character and appearance of urban areas, biodiversity and heritage assets

- Policy DM24: This policy relates to parking and requires new development to provide off-street parking in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards SPD

Supplementary Planning Documents

Quality Places SPD

3.8 Having reviewed the Council's Quality Places SPD (2011), the main guidance of relevance falls within the architectural detail section. With regards rooflines, the guidance advises that rooflines should complement surrounding development.

3.9 With regards ancillary buildings, the guidance states that garages should be sympathetically related to the main dwelling, whether they are adjoined or free-standing. The document goes on to say that pitched or lean-to roofs are normally preferable to flat roofs as they are more likely to complement the existing house and locality.

Residential Parking Standards SPD (2009)

3.10 This SPD requires 2 or 3 bedroom properties to provide 2 parking spaces. The parking standards also note that garages less than 6m x 3m (measured internally) will not count towards parking provision. No explanation is provided within the SPD to justify this rationale.

Character Area Appraisal: Eastleigh (2008)

3.11 The Council's Character Appraisal for Eastleigh splits up the town into different areas of character. The site lies within area 15, which is deemed as an area of strong character due to the regular grid layout and the strong sense of enclosure resulting from the shallow building setbacks and continuous building frontage. The appraisal also notes the consistent use of red brick also adds to the distinct character of the area.

3.12 The appraisal sets out the following guidance for new development within this area:

- Maintain the predominant shallow building setbacks and continuous building frontage in order to retain the sense of enclosure provided by existing development
- Minimise the requirement for on-street parking in new development
- Maintain the predominant brick wall plot boundaries
- Ensure that the materials applied in new development are similar or complementary to those prominent in existing development

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 Aside from the application the subject of this appeal, there have been a number of planning applications at the site, summarised below:

Application reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
F/09/66044	Erection of detached garage/workshop	Refuse	04/12/2009
F/06/56298	Erection of 1 no. 2 bed chalet style bungalow	Refuse	10/04/2006
F/04/52716	Erection of 2 bedroom detached dwelling	Refuse	19/01/2005
Z/63104/002/00	Erection of detached garage and workshop	Approve	31/07/2001
Z/64104/001/00	Single storey rear extension	Approve	24/09/1999

4.2 The main application of relevance is the most recent application for the erection of a detached garage/workshop. This application was refused with the Council stating that the height, size and scale of the building would introduce a feature of unwelcome prominence within the existing street scene.

4.3 The previous application for a chalet bungalow was refused predominantly because a dwelling in this location would be out of character with the surroundings. The Council also advised that the dwelling would overbear neighbouring properties through overshadowing and a visual intrusion of neighbouring gardens.

4.4 There are also some planning applications within the vicinity of the site that are of relevance. These are discussed in more detail below:

<u>52 Chamberlayne Road</u>

4.5 The first planning application of relevance is F/12/70747, which proposed an extension to an existing garage to form a new double garage at 52 Chamberlayne Road (4 properties to the north of the application site). The application was approved in May 2012.

4.6 The permission at 52 Chamberlayne Road allowed a garage outbuilding measuring 6.95 metres wide (almost the width of the plot) by 4.21 metres tall (to the ridge line). The planning officer's delegated report noted that:

> *"the size and design of the proposed garage is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality"*
>
> and
>
> *"there are a mix of rear outbuildings viewable within this rear access road and notwithstanding the size and scale of the proposed garage; I do not consider that the development will result in an incongruous addition to the area. While the size will result in a rather obvious concern, the dual pitched roof design seeks to reduce the visual impact of the garage, which in my opinion would successfully negate any resultant dominance or visually obtrusive form of development"*

4.7 The planning officer also noted that there would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking. He also stated that while the outbuilding did result in the loss of some light to part of the garden of the neighbouring property, the garden area affected does not consist of the neighbour's primary useable amenity space.



View of the outbuilding of 52 Chamberlayne Road viewed from the rear service road

119 Cranbury Road

4.8 This site lies a short distance to the south-east of the application site. The planning application of relevance is F/06/58651 which proposed the conversion of a shop to form a 2 bedroom flat, together with a two storey rear extension to form a one bedroom flat with associated bin and cycle storage. The application was approved in January 2007 and has since been implemented.

4.9 The planning application at 119 Cranbury Road is considered relevant because of the development to the rear of the site, namely the two storey extension. This extension fronts directly onto Blenheim Road, and adds considerable mass and bulk to the Blenheim Road street scene and is highly prominent when walking west to east along this part of Blenheim Road.



View of the extension to 119 Cranbury Road viewed from Blenheim Road

65 Chamberlayne Road

4.10 This site lies a short distance to the north-west of the application site. There have been two planning applications of relevance at this site. The first was approved in 1987 and allowed a single storey rear extension and erection of double garage. The second was approved in 1994 and allowed the erection of an additional garage at the site. Both planning permissions have been implemented, resulting in a substantial outbuilding at the site.





Left: Views of the approved outbuilding to the rear of 65 Chamberlayne Road

5. Key Determining Issues

5.1 The following are considered to be the key planning issues which will determine the outcome of the appeal:

- Would the height, scale and size of the outbuilding dominate the street scene and harm the prevailing character of the area?
- Would the position of the proposed rooflights lead to an unacceptable level of overlooking to neighbouring properties?
- Would the proposal result in the loss of off-street car parking?

5.2 These issues are discussed in more detail below:

Impact on the character of the area and street scene

5.3 The Council allege, in refusal reason 1, that the proposed alterations to the existing outbuilding would have an unacceptable impact on the street scene, due to the prominence of the building, while at the same time harming the character of the wider area.

5.4 It is of course highly subjective to assess what form of development is deemed to have an unacceptable level of impact on its surroundings. In this case, we have an existing outbuilding of limited architectural merit. The outbuilding, in its current form therefore makes an arguably negative impact on the street scene.

5.5 The proposed development seeks to alter the architectural form of the outbuilding from the current flat-roofed design to a pitched roof design. Pitched roof buildings are generally more visually pleasing than a flat-roofed design, a point made clear in the Council's Quality Places SPD (discussed in paragraphs 3.8-3.9 of this document).

5.6 The principle of replacing a flat-roofed outbuilding with a pitched roof design can therefore be argued to be complying with the guidelines set out within the Quality Places SPD, and thus also enhancing the visual appearance of the outbuilding.

5.7 The Council's refusal reason makes specific reference to the scale and size of the outbuilding causing harm to the street scene. The use of the terms scale and size gives the impression that the outbuilding is being enlarged (in terms of its footprint). In fact, the scale and size (so far as length and width dimensions) is dictated by the existing outbuilding structure, the footprint of which is not being enlarged.

5.8 The main point of contention is therefore not the size and scale of the outbuilding, but the proposed increase in height from the current approx. 2.5 metres to a maximum height of 5 metres (to the ridge line). The roof would be orientated such that a gable end would front Blenheim Road.

5.9 The resulting height of the outbuilding would lead to an increase in prominence of the outbuilding on Blenheim Road. However, this does not mean that the impact of the outbuilding would be harmful to the street scene, especially taking into account the negative visual impact the outbuilding as existing has on the surroundings.

5.10 The street scene along this part of Blenheim Road (on the northern side) is uninspiring and devoid of features, largely because the street scene is made up of the side boundary (and associated boundary treatments) of corner plot properties of the roads running north to south in the area (Chamberlayne Road, Cranbury Road, Nutbeem Road etc).

5.11 The height of the proposed outbuilding is still clearly subservient to the prevailing two storey height of development in the immediate surroundings, and is of similar height to a number of other approved outbuildings in the area (including those referred to in Section 4 of this report).

5.12 There is a prevalence of pitched roof outbuildings in the area visible from Blenheim Road (such as looking north along the service road to the rear of the site), and a further example of a pitched roof outbuilding adjacent to Blenheim Road to the west of the site (near the junction with Nutbeem Road).



Left: View of a large outbuilding adjacent to Blenheim Road (near the Nutbeem Road junction)



Left: View looking north from Blenheim Road along the service road to the rear of the appeal site, where at least two pitched roof outbuildings are clearly visible

5.13 The example of an outbuilding at 65 Chamberlayne Road (discussed in Section 4 of this report) is also relevant, given this plot is similar to the appeal site, being a corner plot where the outbuilding is prevalent on the street scene of the adjacent road (Factory Road in this case).

5.14 Given the numerous examples of outbuildings in the vicinity of the appeal site that are of a similar form and height to that proposed in this instance, it is clear that the form of development proposed at the appeal site has been allowed on other sites in the locality, and therefore been judged not to harm the street scene. The question to

explore further is why the appeal site and proposed development is not being treated in the same manner as the examples of similar development referred to throughout this report.

5.15 The Council's assertion appears to be that because the appeal site is a corner plot with a road adjacent, the proximity of the site to the adjacent road makes the appeal proposal unacceptable, even though similar forms of development exist in the vicinity.

5.16 Sites such as 52 Chamberlayne Road and its associated outbuilding (discussed further in Section 4) still have an impact on a street scene, just that the street in question is a service road. Nonetheless, the service road is a public right of way and in our view there is little difference in how an outbuilding in this location should be assessed so far as impact on street scene is concerned, given the service road is still deemed a highway.

5.17 The fact the outbuilding at 52 Chamberlayne Road was approved, and the Planning Officer made clear in his delegated report he had assessed the impact the outbuilding would have on the street scene and character of the surroundings (see paragraph 4.6 of this report) needs to be given a great deal of weight in considering what form of development is acceptable at the appeal site.

5.18 While the appeal site proposal is marginally greater in height than that approved at 52 Chamberlayne Road, the scale and form of development approved is still comparable with that proposed at the appeal site.

5.19 The existing outbuilding at the appeal site is only visible to short distance views along Blenheim Road. The proposed increase in height of the outbuilding will not result in the site becoming more visually prominent from further afield, as the surrounding residential development obscures longer distance views towards the site.

5.20 In summary with regards impact on the street scene, the impact is clearly highly localised to a small stretch of Blenheim Road. In our view, the current outbuilding does not make a positive contribution to the street scene, and the proposed alterations will enhance the appearance of the outbuilding by replacing a flat-roof for a pitched roof design, (as stipulated as being a preferential form of development in the Quality Places SPD).

5.21 The proposed increase in height does not lead to the site being unduly prominent, taking into account the surroundings, some of which have similar forms of outbuilding. There are also several examples of sites where substantial (prominent) extensions of greater height than that proposed at the appeal site have been approved, even though those extensions are immediately adjacent to the road (e.g. 119 Cranbury Road).

5.22 On this basis, the increase in height of the outbuilding is justified, so far as measuring the impact on the street scene.

5.23 Refusal reason 1 also advises that the proposal will be detrimental to the character of the area. To argue that a development proposal is out of character suggests that there are no examples of the form of development proposed within the vicinity of the site.

5.24 It has been demonstrated throughout this report that the appeal proposal proposes a similar form of development to that already allowed at a number of sites in the area. In this respect, the proposal therefore cannot be deemed to be out of character with the area as some sort of alien feature.

5.25 The Council's Character Appraisal SPD (discussed further in paragraphs 3.11-3.12) is an important guide which sets out the parameters to ensure that proposed development complies with the prevailing characteristics of the area. In this case, the proposed development complies with the guidance within the Character Appraisal, and therefore complies with the stated aims and objectives for new development within this part of Eastleigh.

5.26 The existing outbuilding contributes to the character of the area. As per our comments on the topic of street scene, in our view, the outbuilding does not make a positive impact on the character of the area. The change of design, even incorporating an increase in height to the outbuilding, will, in our view enhance the appearance of the outbuilding, and therefore make a more positive contribution to the character of the area.

5.27 The judgement of whether a development proposal has a positive or negative impact on the character of an area is always a subjective topic that is not easily quantified by planning policy. In this case, it is considered that the proposal takes full and proper account of the surroundings, and proposes a form of development that has already been approved a number of times in the wider area, including on corner plot sites with a road adjacent to the side. As such, the proposal complies with the aims of Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan, and therefore also complies with the prevailing character of the area.

Impact on neighbouring properties

5.28 The second refusal reason relates to concerns that the position of rooflights on the west facing elevation of the outbuilding would lead to an unacceptable degree of overlooking to neighbouring properties.

5.29 The refusal notice makes specific reference to the impact on the adjoining property, 58 Chamberlayne Road. It is considered that this is the only property that could potentially be affected by the proposed development, given there are no windows proposed on the other elevations.

5.30 The proposal seeks to provide three velux windows on the west facing roof slope. The angle of the roof is approximately 45 degrees, and the amount of headroom available where the rooflights are positioned is approximately 1.5 metres.

5.31 These factors ensure that there can be no direct view towards no 58 Chamberlayne Road from within the proposed roof space, save for a scenario where the window is open and one is stood directly under the window with their head peering through the roof itself.

5.32 The natural angle of view from these rooflights is narrowed by the recess in the roof structure (see generic photo of a velux window below). This design ensures that views from the velux windows in the outbuilding will only be towards the host dwelling.



This generic view from a velux window confirms that views to either side are obscured by the roof structure around the rooflight

5.33 The combination of the design, roof angle and limited headroom ensures that it will not be practical for the privacy of any neighbouring properties to be intruded upon from within the proposed roofspace. Even if one is sat down under one of the rooflights, one's view is tunnelled (in a straight line towards the sky) because of the thickness of the roof structure and window frame.

5.34 In this case, the location of the staircase will be in close proximity to the nearest window to number 58 Chamberlayne Road, further ensuring that access to this window is limited, so far as using it for a possible privacy intrusion to the neighbouring property.

5.35 The remaining two windows are not obstructed, but, for the reasons stated above, would not offer any view towards 58 Chamberlayne Road or other surrounding properties. There would certainly not be any permanent visual intrusion towards any of the surrounding properties as a result of the proposed rooflights, with a fleeting glimpse at a very oblique angle the most likely view possible from the site towards the neighbouring properties.

5.36 In summary on this matter, the Council allege in refusal reason 2 that the proposed rooflights would lead to an unacceptable degree of overlooking to neighbouring properties, and particularly no 58 Chamberlayne Road. The above text has demonstrated that any overlooking is going to be highly unlikely, due to the roof slope and design of the rooflights preventing a wider aspect view.

5.37 As such, refusal reason 2 is wrong to suggest the proposal will lead to an 'unacceptable degree of overlooking/loss of privacy and visual intrusion' to any of the neighbouring properties.

Parking

5.38 The proposed floor plans for the outbuilding clearly show that it is possible for a car to park in the garage, even once some of the floorspace is 'lost' to accommodate the staircase.

5.39 The Council argue that because the garage (parking area) would measure less than 6m x 3m, that the parking space shown on the proposed floor plans does not qualify as a recognised parking space that complies with the Council's Parking Standards SPD. No reference is made within the SPD or the officer's delegated report as to why the space proposed in this case (which is clearly large enough for a family sized car) is not deemed acceptable.

5.40 While we consider the outbuilding as proposed retains one off-road parking space, we do not consider the issue of parking should be relevant to the determining of this appeal. The Council have no control as to whether the garage is used for an off-road parking space or not, as there are no restrictions/conditions placed upon the garage that require it to be maintained as an off-road parking space.

5.41 The applicant could also theoretically use their permitted development rights to change the garage into some form of ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling. Such a proposal would result in the permanent loss of the garage for parking purposes.

5.42 The applicant is therefore under no requirement at the present time to use the garage for off-road parking. The appeal proposals therefore do not result in a net loss of off-road parking at the site, whether it is accepted that the space provided for car parking within the garage is sufficient or not. The fact the site does not comply with the

Council's Parking Standards SPD (which required two off-road spaces be provided for 3 bedroom properties) is also not relevant to the determining of this appeal

5.43 As the proposed development does not increase the number of bedrooms at the site, the proposal therefore does not result in an increase in the number of parking spaces required as per the guidance set out in the Council's Parking Standards SPD.

5.44 As the appeal proposals do not change the existing parking situation, nor result in additional demand for parking at the site, there is no justification for the Council to refuse the planning application on the grounds of insufficient parking.

5.45 In summary on this matter, refusal reason 3 argues that the loss of parking at the site as a result of the appeal proposal would be detrimental to the amenity of nearby properties. The Council's judgement on this matter is highly flawed, given there is no official (i.e. designated/controllable) off-road parking at the appeal site to lose in the first place. Furthermore, the appeal proposals do not result in the loss of any parking space (whether it is used for this purpose or not) within the garage. On this basis, refusal reason 3 is considered to be null and void so far as determining this appeal is concerned.

6. Summary

6.1 The appeal the subject of this report relates to proposed alterations to an existing outbuilding at 60 Chamberlayne Road, Eastleigh. Eastleigh Borough Council refused a planning application for the enlargement of the outbuilding (by way of roof alteration from a flat-roofed design to pitched roof) on three grounds, namely the impact on the street scene and character of the area, the impact on privacy of neighbouring properties, and the loss of parking at the site.

6.2 This report has sought to demonstrate that the development proposal will not harm the street scene or character of the area. Outbuildings of various shapes and sizes (including some comparable in size to that proposed at the appeal site) are prevalent within the surroundings, and the proposed development therefore fully integrates with the character of the surroundings.

6.3 With regards the street scene, the proposed outbuilding will remain subservient in height and scale to the residential surroundings. The existing outbuilding does not make a positive contribution to the street scene, and the proposed outbuilding, while taller will at the same time be a more visually pleasing design, with the existing flat-roof being replaced with a pitched roof, in accordance with advice contained within the Council's Quality Spaces SPD.

6.4 In concluding the proposal would have an unacceptable degree of overlooking to neighbouring properties (58 Chamberlayne Road in particular), it is considered the Council have failed to take account of the roof slope, limited headroom and design (i.e. the obscured view from a Velux window). These factors ensure that very limited, if any overlooking would be possible from the outbuilding. The very limited level of overlooking cannot be deemed to be to an unacceptable degree, especially taking account of the urban surroundings, where a degree of overlooking from neighbouring properties is commonplace.

6.5 The final refusal reason relating to parking is not considered relevant to the appeal proposal. The proposal does not relate in the loss of a parking space, with drawings clearly showing the garage is still large enough to provide parking for a family sized car. More importantly, the Council have no control over the use of the garage for off-road parking, meaning the applicant can choose to use the garage for parking or otherwise, whatever the outcome of the appeal

6.6 All things considered, the proposed development is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2006), as well as the guidance contained within the Quality Places SPD and Eastleigh Character Area Appraisal. On this basis, we believe the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the proposed development is unsubstantiated, and that the appeal against the refusal of planning permission should therefore be allowed.