

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: 25th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3172554

6 Haig Road, Bishopstoke, Eastleigh, Hampshire SO50 8HX

- 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 Jamie Gregory against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/16/79263, dated 19 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor rear extensions and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Jamie Gregory against Eastleigh Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed first floor rear extension on the character and appearance of the area and whether the proposed front porch would prevent adequate and safe off-street parking and turning from being provided at the property.

Reasons

First Floor Rear Extension

4. The appeal property is the northern most two storey semi-detached house in a group of similar 1920s semi-detached houses raised above the level of Haig Road and accessed by a separate gravel track running in front of them.
 5. Haig Road descends in a northerly direction approximately from its junction with Charden Road to its junction with Fair Oak Road. As a result, when looking from the north on Haig Road, the raised side elevation of No 6 can be clearly seen, and the flat roof of the proposed first floor rear extension would also be seen in profile from this viewpoint.
 6. This profile of the proposed extension would also be noticeable through the gap between the first two dwellings on the south side of Earls Close, albeit that this view would be partially screened by trees when in leaf. There would also be a
-

clear view of the extension, including its flat roof, through a gap between two of the houses on the south west side of the turning head in Earls Close.

7. The appellant points out that No 8, the neighbouring dwelling in this pair of dwellings, has a similar flat roofed first floor rear extension, as does No 12. He also states that the Council recently granted permission for a similar first floor rear extension to No 14¹.
8. I acknowledge that the first floor rear extensions to Nos 8 and 12 form part of the existing character and appearance of the area because they can be seen obliquely from Haig Road and Charden Road, as the similarly designed approved extension at No 14 would also be if it was built.
9. But the proposed extension would be more prominent from longer views on Haig Road and from Earls Road because of its raised position in relation to these viewpoints and the fact that it is the northern most of these 1920s houses. In this respect I note that the *Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document* urges consideration of the steep bank at the eastern end of Fair Oak Road on the visual impact of development. The bank that the appeal site sits on is part of that steep bank or gives rise to the same requirement since views of it are prominent from Haig Road.
10. The proposed extension, although it would match the flat roof of the neighbouring extension at No 8, is not a design feature that would help create a new positive and distinctive character, as required by Key Design Principle 15 of the Council's *Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document*. An extension with a pitched and hipped roof would be more in keeping with the style of this pitched roof dwelling.
11. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed flat roofed first floor rear extension would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not comply with 'saved' Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (LPR), which requires development proposals to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and are appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

Off-Street Parking

12. The Council does not appear to have any design objection to the proposed front porch and I agree it would be unobjectionable in this regard. But it maintains that inadequate information has been provided to demonstrate that sufficient off-street parking and turning space can be provided given that the porch would constrain the frontage parking area to the dwelling.
13. My understanding from the Council's *Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) is that two off-street parking spaces are required for this dwelling. This level of parking is currently achieved at the front and side of the dwelling and includes space to turn round a vehicle without impinging on the steep slope of the adjacent bank. It would be dangerous for the driver if a vehicle was to fall down this steep bank.

¹ LPA Ref F/15/77610 granted 4 January 2016

14. But the proposed porch would constrain the space to the front of the dwelling for both parking and turning because it would project beyond the front building line of the house, in a similar manner to that of the porch at No 12. Moreover, such a projection in line with the northern wall of the property would make it much more difficult if not impossible for a car to access the parking space to the side of the dwelling; a much tighter turning movement would be required of any such vehicle owing to the proximity of the frontage parking and turning space to the steep sides of the adjacent bank.
15. The overall effect of the siting and dimensions of the proposed front porch would therefore be likely to reduce the level of on-site car parking below that required by the SPD. Although Haig Road did not appear to be heavily parked during my visit I consider that two parking spaces should be provided on-site because this dwelling is at the end of the access track some distance away from the road. I am also unaware of what the level of on-street parking may be at night or on the weekend.
16. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed front porch would be likely to prevent adequate and safe off-street parking and turning from being provided at the property. 'Saved' LPR Policy 59.BE requires development to have satisfactory access and layout for vehicles. The proposed porch would mean that this was not possible and so the development would fail to comply with this Policy. 'Saved' LPR Policy 104.T requires adequate off-highway parking up to the standard set out. As set out above, the proposal would fail to provide for the necessary two off-street parking spaces and associated turning requirements effectively and so would fail to comply with this Policy also.

Conclusion

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

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR