The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2017

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3178270
6 St. Austell Close, Bishopstoke, Eastleigh, SO50 6GQ

- 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 Robert Sheppard against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/17/80048, dated 9 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2017.
- The development proposed is erection of porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has raised concerns with regard to how the planning application was handled by the Council. However, such matters fall outside of the remit of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on St. Austell Close and accommodates a two-storey semi-detached property. The surrounding area is residential. The dwellings within St. Austell Close predominately have relatively modest sized, flat roofed plain square porches. The scheme would result in a front porch that would be approximately 2.2 metres in depth and 2.9 metres in width. The porch would have a mono pitch roof that would have a height of 2.8 metres to the eaves and 3.5 metres to the ridge height.

5. I observed that there is a porch already in place at the appeal property, which I understand is the subject of enforcement proceedings. The proposed development largely reflects the dimensions of the porch currently in situ, although, it proposes alterations to the roof to remove the existing overhang. Although materially different by virtue of the changes to the roof, I consider that the existing porch provides a good representation of the mass and scale of the proposed porch in this case.

6. As a result of its width, depth and height, the proposed porch would represent a significant structure. I consider that due to its overall mass and scale, the

proposed porch would be an overly large and dominant feature to the host dwelling, which would cause harm to its character and appearance. In addition, the porch would be highly visible in the street scene and would appear as an overly prominent and incongruous feature, which would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The appellant has referred to a large number of other examples of porches in the surrounding area, which I observed on my site visit. However, the vast majority of these are much smaller in scale and do not dominate their host dwellings. I acknowledge that there is a large porch at No 10 St. Austell Close. Whilst this may be comparable in overall size, it is predominantly constructed of glass and in my view, does not appear overly dominant against the host dwelling. Further, I understand that the porch at No 10 was granted permission some time ago and before the adoption of the current development plan policies.

8. The appellant has also mentioned a large addition to the property opposite the appeal site, which was granted planning permission by the Council. However, I have not been provided with any substantive details in relation to this development. Further, I am mindful that each proposal must be considered on its own merits. Given all of this, I am not of the view that the other examples of porches or other developments in the area provide any precedent for the scheme or alter any of my above findings.

9. In conclusion, the porch, by virtue of its depth, width and height, represents an overly dominant and incongruous feature which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As a result, the scheme conflicts with Saved Policy 59.BE of Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan (2006), which seeks to ensure that new development takes full and proper account of the context of the site, including the character and appearance of the locality and is appropriate in terms of (amongst other things) mass and scale. Further, I also consider that the scheme runs contrary to the guidance provided in the Council's 'Quality Places' and 'Character Area Appraisals' Supplementary Planning Documents.

Other matters

10. I acknowledge that the appellant is trying to make improvements to his home and that making alterations to the porch could be costly. I also accept that the appellant has sought to work constructively with the Council and there is support for the proposal from local residents. However, these matters individually or in combination are not sufficient to overcome or outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the scheme conflicts with the development plan, when considered as a whole. I consider that there are no material considerations that outweigh the development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR