
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2017

by Ken Barton BSc(Hons) DipArch DipArb RIBA FCI Arb

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

Decision date: 1st August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3174385

25 Stourvale Gardens, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh SO53 3NE

- 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 Ethan Farrell against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/17/79914, dated 17 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey front extension, access steps and landing/terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Effect on the Character and Appearance of the Surrounding Area

2. The entrance to that part of Stourvale Gardens, a cul-de-sac, which includes the appeal site, is steep. On the left the road curves away and abuts the side of No 19. On the right hand side of the road are five three storey houses, Nos 24-28 inclusive. They have integral garages at lower ground floor level and recessed entrances at a raised ground floor level reached by a curving access path/staircase. Due to the topography the ridge levels step down the slope.
3. No 28 is grassed at the front without winding steps to the entrance whilst No 27 is built of a different brick to the appeal property and has a lawn not a terraced garden at the front. No 26 has the same brick as the appeal site with both a lawn and terraced garden. No 24 is of a different brick to the appeal site and has a different mix of terrace and planting at the front. No 24 also has a rear and side extension that is visible from the road when leaving the cul-de-sac as the curve of the road means that Nos 24-28 face slightly in towards each other. Despite the cosmetic differences between the houses they are of predominantly the same strong, distinctive design.
4. The proposal would enclose the recessed front entrance and extend it around a metre further forward with a lean-to pitched roof. Although relatively small, the enclosed and enlarged structure on the front elevation would be far more prominent than the existing extension at No 24. Whilst there have been no objections, the proposal would detract from the strong character and appearance of the group of houses, a type of impact anticipated by the Council's *Quality Places* Supplementary Planning Document. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with the aims of saved Local Plan Policy 59.BE and emerging Local Plan Policy DM1.

Ken Barton

Inspector