



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

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

Decision date: 22nd August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/17/3175331

1 Fryern Close, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire SO53 2LF

- 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 Andrew Dubber against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/16/79351, dated 6 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new detached house with amenity space, car parking and access off Fryern Close.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of the garden of No 1 Fryern Close. The area is primarily residential in nature, properties are generally semi-detached, and there is a sense of rhythm to the built form. Corner plots in this area provide generous green spaces between the groups of houses, contributing to the pattern of development and maintaining a sense of openness. The appeal site contributes to this sense of space, it is on a prominent corner location, and sets the rhythm for the built form along this section of Fryern Close. Although the appeal site is screened by vegetation it is still laid out as garden, and this absence of built form is an important feature of the site with regards to how it contributes to the overall character of the area.
4. The proposal would substantially fill the gap between No 1 Fryern Close and Oakmount Road. This would significantly erode the sense of space that the site currently exhibits, which would be detrimental to the character of the area at the entrance to Fryern Close. The appellant asserts that the current vegetation along the boundary would be reduced in height and that the proposal would then improve the street scene. It is my view that an additional dwelling at this location, even with some screening, would erode the sense of space that this site currently reinforces due to the construction of a building at this point. Although the proposal would not project past the front building line of No 1, and would be set back from the building line of those properties along

Oakmount Road, it would still be highly visible due to the nature of the plot. As a result it would be an overly prominent form of development and would diminish the current openness of the plot, this would remove the strong sense of rhythm that the corner plots provide and would harm the character and appearance of the area.

5. The appellant has referred to permissions granted on other corner plots in the area. The evidence does not set out the full details of these developments and on the evidence submitted it is not clear what circumstances led to the approval of these schemes. Accordingly I do not consider them to be directly comparable. Furthermore, each case must be considered independently and I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
6. Consequently, I find that the proposal in terms of its siting and location on a prominent corner plot would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001 – 2011 and Policy DM1 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029 insofar as those policies seek to ensure development respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would cause harm to the local character of the area and would therefore conflict with paragraph 53 of the Framework.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR