The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2017

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3176006
60 Chamberlayne Road, Eastleigh SO50 5JH

- 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 & Mrs Scott and Beth Kerwood against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application, Ref. F/1780074, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2017.
- The development proposed is alterations to an existing outbuilding to provide first floor accommodation above the existing garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 58 Chamberlayne Road as regards privacy, and (iii) the effect on on-street parking.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, the Council's view is that the proposed alterations to the existing garage to form the first floor living accommodation would, because of the increase in the building's height, size and scale, be unduly prominent and at odds with the prevailing character of this section of Blenheim Road.

4. I saw on my visit that with its position adjoining the northern side of Blenheim Road and fairly large size the existing garage is already a noticeable building in the views in both directions along Blenheim Road. However, its current single storey form, design and function is in keeping with the predominantly subservient and outbuilding character of the area that includes the access road to the rear gardens of the dwellings in Chamberlayne and Cranbury Roads.

5. With these points in mind, I endorse the Council's assessment that the alterations and additions necessary to form living accommodation on the first floor would result in the garage building having an unwelcome prominence. Indeed, in my view its increase in height and a design giving a more residential appearance in the context of the building's more utilitarian surroundings would draw the eye and be perceived as a somewhat incongruous addition to the

Blenheim Road street scene. I note that there are a number of objections to the scheme from local residents who are essentially of the same opinion.

6. I have noted the appellants' points that there are buildings of a comparable size in the area including to the rear of 119 Cranbury Road and Nos. 52 and 65 Chamberlayne Road. However, I do not consider that these justify the adverse effect of the particular combination of position, size and design of the appeal building. More specifically in the case of Nos. 52 and 65, to the extent that they form a precedent it is in my view not one that should necessarily be followed, especially in the light of my comments on the existing character of the area in paragraph 4 above.

7. Overall, on this issue I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 (albeit in respect of the latter I have noted the update in the grounds of appeal that if correct would negate the attachment of weight in this appeal).

8. Turning briefly to issues (ii) privacy and (iii) parking, the Council's assessment was in my view ostensibly reasonable in assuming that there would be the potential for the overlooking of No. 58's rear garden and the loss of an existing off street parking space. However, having considered the grounds of appeal I consider that whilst neither concern can be entirely ruled out, the circumstances of this case are such that firstly the existing level of privacy would be for the most part maintained because of the roof design and window positions, and secondly there is no certainty that the off street space in the garage would be used for parking in the absence of the appeal proposal going ahead.

9. Although these issues do not in my view materially add to the Council's case for a refusal on the first issue of character and appearance, neither do they clearly outweigh that reason for a rejection of the appeal scheme, which I consider to have been properly justified in the officer's report and the Notice of Refusal. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR