The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3172826
Oakdale, Long Lane, Bursledon, Southampton SO31 8DA

- 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 David Wilkinson against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/16/79743, dated 12 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2017.
- The development proposed is described as a new hobby workshop / garage, with single roller door and window to front elevation.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hobby workshop / garage, with single roller door and window to the front of Oakdale, Long Lane, Bursledon, Southampton SO31 8DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/16/79743, dated 12 December 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: unnumbered 1:1250 Location Plan & 1:500 Block Plan; 1:200 Site plan; & 1:100 Plans & Elevations.

    3) The building hereby approved shall be faced in materials to match the bricks and tiles on the existing house.

    4) No excavation, demolition or development related works shall take place on site until an Arboricultural Method Statement, as per British Standard 5837:2012 (Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations) and a Tree Protection Plan are submitted and approved by the LPA. The approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan must be adhered to in full, and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the LPA.

    5) Prior to completion and first use of the outbuilding hereby approved details of the boundary treatment to the front (west) and northern boundaries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority, and implemented accordingly.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed domestic workshop/garage building on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an L-shaped house immediately to the south of the vets on the corner of Long Lane and Bursledon Heights. The proposal is to erect a detached outbuilding measuring 5m wide, 6m deep and 3.5m high, next to that part of the house that was formerly a garage but which has been converted to habitable accommodation.

4. It would be close to the road boundary but 1.25m away from it according to the appellant's representations. The garage's walls are proposed to be rendered but the appellant has made clear that he would have no objection to them being faced in brick to match the house. The proposed building would be sited next to the north boundary of the site, which is planted with high conifer trees and beyond which is a large and high timber garage on the site of the vets.

5. The building would be noticeable when walking or driving down the north facing incline of Bursledon Heights and from directly opposite. The appellant has indicated that he intends to remove the high wall and fencing from the road frontage and replace it with a boundary treatment of less than 1m as well as to suitably landscape the frontage. I agree that the present high wall/fence is unsightly, albeit that the appellant could replace it without erecting the proposed garage.

6. However, the immediate area is characterised by houses in generally large plots with large detached garages, many of which are larger than the one proposed here and as close to the road frontage, principally on the nearby plots on Long Lane including the vets. There is no suggestion by the Council that the design of the building itself in unacceptable and it would, with its pitched and hipped roof, match others nearby.

7. As such I conclude that the proposed garage would be in character with the area. Its appearance can be conditioned to ensure it matches the host dwelling and the frontage and northern boundary can also be improved as part of this application by imposing an additional condition requiring the Council's prior approval for new boundary treatments. I therefore impose these conditions.

8. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring the submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan to protect trees to be retained on the site and I consider this is necessary in the interests of the verdant character of the area. The additional suggested condition related to a site meeting with a retained arboricultralist and a Council representative can be encompassed in the AMS. The slope of the site makes it unlikely that surface water will drain onto the public highway so a condition preventing that is unnecessary. The Council has also suggested a condition listing the approved plans and this is required in the interests of precision.

9. 'Saved' Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review states that development proposals will be permitted when they take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. For the above reasons the proposal would comply with this Policy.

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Fagan, INSPECTOR