The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/17/3170328
35 Oakgrove Road, Bishopstoke SO50 6LN

- 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 Guiseppe Zagaroli against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/16/78907, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2016.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new semi-bungalow.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council refer to Policies DM1 and DM4 of the submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2014. I note that the Council intend to replace this document with a new local plan and will not make any further progress on the 2014 version. I therefore give these policies very little weight.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a single storey, detached residential bungalow within a long row of similar properties. Although there were isolated examples of 1 ½ and 2 storey dwellings and large rear extensions, the prevailing character and appearance of this part of Oakgrove Road was one of modest, single storey bungalows with pyramid roofs set back from the road by a uniform distance behind driveways and parking areas.

5. The proposal would have a very different form and appearance to the existing property. In particular, the roof would sit in stark contrast to the prevailing design of roof forms within the street, constructed with a part gable with small hipped elements on either side. In combination with an overall increase in the width, height and overall scale of the roof and in such close proximity to the side boundary with No. 36, it would be noticeably out of keeping with the prevailing pattern, character and appearance of the street. It would be unduly dominant and overly prominent in its appearance and this would be

exacerbated by the arrangement and amount for roof lights in the front facing roof slope, which would be somewhat incongruous and alien features. Overall and in its context, it would not be a high quality of design.

6. I accept that No. 34 was previously granted permission by the Council in 2005 for substantial alterations. However, that proposal is of some age and I found that it is an isolated example that does not represent the prevailing character and appearance of the area. In my view it does not justify what would amount to further harmful development and in any event each case must be determined on its own merits.

7. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2006 and the Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document 2001. When read as a whole and amongst other things, requires a high quality of design, permits development in accordance with other policies in the plan that takes full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the Borough's urban areas.

Other Matters

8. The Council's second reason for refusal relates to insufficient information to allow a proper consideration of flood risk. I note that a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted with the appeal but that the Council have not considered it appropriate to comment on it. Whilst this approach is somewhat unhelpful, given my findings in terms of character and appearance had I been minded to allow the appeal I would have sought further clarification from the parties. However, I have not considered it necessary to consider this matter any further as it would not alter my decision to dismiss the appeal.

9. I acknowledge that pre-application discussions were held with the Council and that the proposal is a re-submission but this has no bearing on my consideration of the planning matters in this appeal. Although there is no dispute that the proposal would provide updated living accommodation with the use of more sustainable construction methods this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in terms of the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

10. Although I have been referred by the Council to an appeal at Fair Oak Road, my consideration of this appeal must be based solely on the merits of the proposal before me. It has not therefore been determinative in my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan and having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR