

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/17/3171338

Shenstone, 122 Winchester Road, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5HZ

- 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 Dunn against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 26896/005, dated 28 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 03 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-bay oak garage with log store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-bay oak garage with log store at Shenstone, 122 Winchester Road, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5HZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 26896/005, dated 28 November 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: Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Block Plan at scale 1:500 and Drg No TD-001.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow that, in common with all other properties along this side of Winchester Road, is set well back from the plot's frontage. The proposal is to erect a detached, two-bay, timber garage and log store to the front of the dwelling and positioned close to the side boundary with 124 Winchester Road.
 4. Winchester Road at this point has a reasonably wide carriageway that is lined on both sides with a pavement and grass verge. I saw during my visit a number of properties with fairly substantial garage buildings within their frontages. In most cases these are recessed behind the front boundary and sit
-

within landscaped settings such that they have little impact upon the fairly spacious and verdant feel to the street scene. Whilst I accept that none of these examples were in the immediate proximity of No 122, I could discern little difference between the character of this particular stretch of Winchester Road and those locations where forward set garages exist. I am not therefore persuaded that a similar type structure in this location need necessarily cause harm by having any materially different kind of impact.

5. In this instance the garage would be set around 4m deep into the plot and behind a mature landscaped frontage. There would be ample space to ensure that the building would appear neither cramped within its setting nor overly dominant in relation to the dwelling. My impression is that the proposal would reflect a number of other similar type developments along Winchester Road, each of which contributes to the variety of architecture within the locality whilst also retaining the spacious qualities of the street scene. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would respect the character, identity and context of its surroundings, in accord with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy, which was adopted in 2014.
6. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. The Council has suggested a condition requiring that the materials used are as specified within the application. However, these are shown as an integral part of the proposal on the planning drawings. No such condition is therefore necessary.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR