
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/16/3163456
13 Waters Edge, Hedge End SO30 4AE

- 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 and Mrs Harman against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/16/78797, dated 22 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension with integral garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Amendments were made to the proposed parking arrangements prior to the application's determination by the Council and are shown on drawing 'Design 4A – 11.10.16 PG No: 08. I have therefore had regard to the parking details shown on the aforementioned drawing.
 3. The appellants are of the view that the saved policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) of 2006 (the Local Plan) should be treated as being time expired and thus out of date. The reason for refusal alleges conflict with Policy 59.BE (Promoting Good Design), which is a general development management policy that is subject to a saving direction issued by the Secretary of State. I consider that Policy 59.BE is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) policies relating to good design. Accordingly given saved Policy 59.BE's consistency with the Framework and the provisions of paragraph 215 of the Framework I consider that Policy 59.BE is applicable to the determination of this appeal.
 4. The reason for refusal alleges conflict with Policy DM1 of the Council's emerging replacement Local Plan which was submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in July 2014. However, the Council's officer report refers to the Council's intention to prepare an alternative replacement Local Plan. As it appears that the examination of the submitted emerging Local Plan will not be completed I consider that very limited weight can be attached to Policy DM1 for the purposes of the determination of this appeal and I shall make no further reference to the emerging Local Plan.
-

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the streetscene within Waters Edge.

Reasons

6. The development would involve the provision of a two storey side extension and its construction would require the demolition of a single garage, which is attached to the neighbouring property's (No 14) garage. The appeal property (No 13) as extended would virtually occupy the full width of its plot and this would result in No 13 having an elongated appearance when compared with the other properties in Waters Edge. Waters Edge comprises detached houses that are of similar designs and a characteristic of this street is the presence of space above the garages between many of the individual houses on the northern side of this road. The extension would result in the significant reduction in the space between Nos 13 and 14. I consider that the combination of the elongated form that No 13 would have and the closure of the first floor space between Nos 13 and 14 would detract from Waters Edge's streetscene.
7. While a number of the other houses in Waters Edge have been extended, none of those properties are of a width that would be comparable with No 13 if the extension was to be built. I therefore consider that the other extensions within Waters Edge do not provide a justification for the appeal development. It has been submitted that a rear extension would not be feasible because of the levels to the rear of No 13, however, No 12 appears to have had a rear extension and has levels comparable with No 13 and I therefore attach limited weight to this aspect of the appellants' case. It has been submitted that there are trees in front of No 13 that would provide screening for the extension, however, I consider that the trees and shrubs in neighbouring gardens would provide very limited screening.
8. I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene within Waters Edge. There would therefore be conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan because the resulting scale of No 13 would not take full and proper account of the property's context. I also consider that there would be conflict with Framework, most particularly paragraph 64, in that the development would not improve the character and quality of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR