
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15/08/17

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/W/17/3172759

Journeys End, 12a Sheldrake Gardens, Hordle, Lymington, Hampshire, SO41 0FJ

- 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 Nicholas Bowen against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/11506, dated 28 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as '*Drive made to garage and drive*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development as set out on the application form is imprecise. I have therefore used the description of development contained in the Council's decision notice form as this describes the development more accurately than the application form.
3. The Council determined the application on the basis of an amended plan it received on 18th January 2017. I have considered the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - 1) The proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - 2) Its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Sheldrake Gardens is a cul-de-sac characterised by a number of close-knit terraces of post-war dwellings. The terraces are fronted by open lawns and off-street parking in the immediate vicinity is provided by way of either a series of garages housed in two separate blocks or, alternatively, from a series of open bays. Several such bays lie directly ahead of No 13's front lawn and are,

I understand, individually allocated to specific properties. Two of the bays, due to their significant depth, appear more as narrow strips of land and on one of these it is proposed that a single width garage is erected with a depth of approximately 7m.

6. The appellant indicates that the proposed building should be considered in the context of the two garage blocks, one of which is in close proximity. That may be the case, but I consider that a clear distinction should be drawn. The garage blocks appear to have been built with the estate and their positioning relative to the various dwellings has a certain coherence given the street layout. On the contrary, the proposed garage building, due to its positioning, would appear as an isolated, incongruous, structure. The adverse impact would be compounded by its substantial length and I consider that such undue prominence would be detrimental to the street scene.
7. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and contrary to the design objectives of Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park (CS) and also relevant advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Amongst other things both seek high quality design which is appropriate and sympathetic to its setting. The proposal would not meet these objectives.

Living conditions

8. The side wall of the new garage would span the total frontage width of Nos 13 and 14. Although its flank would be set back from the properties' front gardens at my site visit I observed that the land drops in level slightly towards the respective lawns. This would accentuate the height of the garage and its impact on the open outlook currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the said dwellings.
9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and this would conflict with another strand of CS Policy CS2 which serves to safeguard against undue impact from unneighbourly developments.

Other matters

10. The appellant refers to the Council having granted planning permission for a single storey extension at No 18. However, this extension is integral to the dwelling unlike the isolated garage now proposed. The use of brickwork to match that of the surrounding buildings or the intention not to use power tools within the building would not mitigate against the harm I have identified would result from the garage's proposed siting. My conclusions are therefore unaffected.

Conclusion

11. I have found harm on both main issues which is compelling. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR