The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2017

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMI

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

Decision date: 17 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3184432
74 Devon Drive, Chandler's Ford SO53 3GH

- 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 Swanborough and Miss Walker against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/17/80443, dated 21 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2017.
- The development proposed is a two storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in a residential area of frontage development. The properties on this side of the road are set above the level of the street with those opposite set down below it. To the west Devon Drive curves gently round to the north, but to the east is straight.

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling with a single storey side element away from the joint boundary. This element joins with a similar element to the next property to the west, 72 Devon Drive, although this property is set further back from the road and forms the end of a terrace of four properties.

5. Part of the character of the area is formed by the gaps between the blocks of buildings at first floor level. These gaps give the area an open appearance as it allows views through them to the rear creating a sense of space.

6. The proposed development would replace the single storey side element with a part one- part two-storey extension extending across the remaining width of the appeal site. The proposal would extend the depth of the whole existing house at ground floor with the first floor being set back 1.5 m from the front elevation, meaning that the proposed ridge would be set down from that of the existing main house.

7. The effect of the proposal would be to prohibit views through the gap for the width of the extension and limit those between Nos 72 and 74 to that of the

remaining element of No 72. This would harmfully limit the sense of space and harmfully reduce the overall open appearance of the area. This would apply whether the landscaping in front of No 72 was to remain or be removed.

8. The appellants have noted that the terrace of which No 72 forms part is set back from the appeal property and consider that the loss of the view through the gap would not be apparent apart from in a restricted aspect. This may be the case, but this does not mitigate the harm for that part of Devon Drive where the view would be lost, and it would still be harmful to the wider character of the area through the loss of sense of space.

9. The appellants have referred to a first floor side extension at 57 Devon Drive which, they indicate, was constructed following an application in 2014. I viewed this property at the site visit. In that case the Council, according to the information provided to me, concluded "the staggered building line in this location limits the impact on the street scene". It is a matter of judgement as to whether effect of the stagger is such to limit the harm. My judgement in the appeal case is that the relationship with No 72 is that the amount of stagger is not sufficient to reduce the harm to the point that the proposal would be acceptable.

10. As such the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) in that it does not take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character of the locality, and is not appropriate in siting in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views. It would also be contrary to paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to respond to local character.

Other matter

11. Both the appellants and Council have referred to a dismissed appeal for a two storey side and single storey rear extension and conservatory and garden/'bike' store at 99 Devon Drive roughly opposite the appeal site. However, I do not have any further details of that proposal beyond the description and consequently am unable to give this decision any material weight in my decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R J Jackson

INSPECTOR