



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/24/3343963

9 Yew Tree Close, Fair Oak, Hampshire, SO50 7GP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jason Somerville against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/24/96688.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an aluminium framed carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an aluminium framed carport at 9 Yew Tree Close, Fair Oak, Hampshire, SO50 7GP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref H/24/96688, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was made retrospectively, and at the time of my visit the carport had been erected and appeared complete.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. Yew Tree Close is a pleasant, residential street lined by grass verges and trees, comprising detached bungalows set behind garden frontages bound to the pavements on both sides by predominantly low brick walls. The dwellings generally have vehicular accesses to the road and frontage parking is commonplace. The appeal relates to a carport that has been erected over a pre-existing hard surface to the front of No 9 covering a single car parking space.
5. Yew Tree Close displays a fairly homogenous character, with residential frontages open to clear view and generally laid to lawn but punctuated with hard surface drives and parking spaces. During the time of my visit in the early afternoon, several properties had cars parked on their frontages. Opportunities for most others to do the same were apparent. The appeal property was no exception.

6. The carport is orientated parallel and close to the road, but with some garden planting in a narrow space between it and the plot's front boundary wall. The structure is open to all four sides and is supported by three slender aluminium posts to each side, with a slightly curved polycarbonate roof over. Despite its forward siting, I was struck by its lightweight and inobtrusive presence, its purpose appearing defined only by the vehicle that was parked beneath it at the time of my visit. The structure displays no solid mass or bulk and resembles more a garden pergola than a carport. I found it to be neither prominent nor visually disruptive within the street scene. Neither does it facilitate the irregular parking of a vehicle to the front of No 9. This would occur regardless and is an already established feature on the appeal site and within the wider area.
7. I accept that there are no equivalent structures to the front of any other properties within the locality. However, that does not render the development harmful. Should any proposals come forward in future to build equivalent or other such structures to the front of other properties in the area, they would each fall to be considered on the individual merits of their case.
8. The absence of any unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area demonstrates that there is no conflict with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), adopted in 2022, or with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed and beautiful places. Although referenced within the Council's reason for refusal, I have not been directed to any specific conflict with the *Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document*, adopted in 2011.
9. I have found no harm to the character or appearance of the street scene. The appeal is therefore allowed. As the development has been carried out, I have no reason to impose any conditions.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR