The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2011

by Michael J Hetherington BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 August 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/11/2155450
99 Devon Drive, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO53 3GJ

- 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 P Chahal against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application ref. F/11/68739, dated 4 February 2011, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2011.
- The development proposed is: two storey side and single storey rear extension and conservatory; garden/'bike' store.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the scheme's effect on the area's character and appearance.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling. Houses in this part of Devon Drive are mainly two-storeys in height and arranged in pairs or groups of four. Dwellings are of a broadly similar scale and design, and are characteristically linked by walls or buildings of an approximately single-storey height. This creates a distinct rhythm within the street scene and establishes a clear degree of separation between the street's two-storey buildings. Where side extensions have been erected, they are generally only a single storey in height. As such, they are generally consistent with the above-noted development pattern.

4. The side extension now proposed would be slightly lower than the roof ridgeline of the existing dwelling and would be set back somewhat at first floor level from the building's main front elevation. However, the two-storey nature of the new addition would be clearly at odds with the distinctive arrangement of other properties nearby, as described above. As a result, the rhythm of development within the street scene would be disrupted and the degree of separation between the appeal property and its neighbour would be markedly reduced. Given the street's established character, the resulting effect would appear incongruous and out of keeping.

5. Although projecting some distance into the property's back garden, the single storey rear extension that is also proposed would not appear unduly discordant, given the degree of screening from the street. While the resulting garden size would be below the 80% figure suggested in the Council's

supplementary planning guidance, it has not been demonstrated that this would be insufficient to meet the needs of the property's occupiers. However, these factors do not outweigh the adverse effects that would result from the proposed two-storey side extension. Accordingly, I conclude that the area's character and appearance would be unacceptably harmed – contrary to policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review.

6. I have considered all the other matters raised, but none change my overall conclusion that the appeal should not succeed.

M J Hetherington

INSPECTOR