

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/16/3157340

54 Horseshoe Drive, Romsey, Hampshire, SO51 7TP.

- 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 John Quaif against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00972/FULLS dated 20 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed garage extension to provide store area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed garage extension to provide store area at 54 Horseshoe Drive, Romsey, Hampshire, SO51 7TP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00972/FULLS dated 20 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 location plan and elevations and details plan drawn to the scales of 1:100, 1:50 and 1:200.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the garage extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing garage.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. Horseshoe Drive is characterised by detached family dwellings occupying wide and generous sized plots. The soft planting within the front gardens, curved alignment of the highway, staggered building lines and garages within the front gardens all contribute to the informal suburban character and appearance of the street scene, as well as a sense of enclosure and privacy.
-

4. Together the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Council Revised Local Plan 2016 (Local Plan) seek to ensure that new development respects and complements the identity and character of local surroundings.
5. The Appeal property is located mid way along Horseshoe Drive and on the inside of a bend in the road. From the south the existing garage and front garden area is screened by the bend in the road, boundary planting and the adjacent property. From the north the existing garage is one of a number of garages located close to the pavement and that are clearly visible within the street scene.
6. The proposed garage extension would be sited closer to the pavement in an area that is currently used for car parking. It is separated from the pavement by a relatively newly planted Laurel hedge and would be set against the boundary hedge to the south of the garage.
7. As indicated in the Council's application report the proposed extension would comprise a continuation of the existing garage, increasing its width by some 3.9 metres. The size of the resultant garage would be less than that of the attached garages serving numerous dwellings in the road. At the same time it would be located a similar distance from the pavement as some of the existing garages and would be sited in an area that is already hard surfaced.
8. Consequently, whilst the resultant garage would project closer to the road, subject to the use of matching materials, it would respect and continue to complement the identity and character of the street scene. The Appeal property's resultant front garden would be comparable in size to other gardens within Horseshoe Drive and the property would retain its spacious setting created by the gap between the appeal dwelling and the dwelling at No.52, along with the recessed siting of the dwelling at No.56.
9. Finally, the Council has suggested the imposition of conditions which require the use of matching external materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. Both of these conditions are necessary to ensure that the proposed extension blends in appropriately with the host dwelling and in the interests of certainty.
10. I conclude that the proposal would reflect and respect the identity and character of the street scene and the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with policy E1 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR