

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/19/3229755

12 Atheling Road, Hythe, Southampton SO45 6BR

- 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 & Mrs Head against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application, Ref. 19/10040, dated 11 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a detached double garage; car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council considers that I can determine the appeal by making an unaccompanied visit taking in views of the property from the road. I have noted the appellant's contrary view on the appeal form that I need to go on to the driveway for the purpose of measuring the proposed area. However, because the application plans are drawn to scale, I was satisfied at my visit that observation from the pavement to Atheling Road, and in particular the driveway entrance, would be sufficient for me to make a full assessment of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene of Atheling Road.

Reasons

4. The Council's concern is that because of a combination of its position and size, the proposed garage would be prominent and intrusive in the street scene of Atheling Road.
 5. I saw on my visit that the dwelling itself has undergone a substantial makeover with extensive alterations and additions that have given it a more contemporary appearance compared with the original bungalow. As a result, the front elevation to some extent draws the eye, not least because of the prominent gabled front porch and the marked contrast with the Victorian No. 14 on the adjoining site.
 6. The construction of a double garage, again of a non-traditional design and with a high ridge line, would be read with the prominent front of the building and in
-

my view be perceived as a somewhat cramped development, thereby eroding the spacious character and appearance of the street scene. It would result in further built form in a prominent location where either an open area or further planting is needed to mitigate the visual impact of the assertive design and increased scale of the host dwelling.

7. I acknowledge that the existing screening would reduce the extent to which the garage would be seen, but as the officer's report correctly observes, this cannot be guaranteed to remain in place on a permanent basis. And the practicality and reasonableness of a condition for its retention is such as to preclude its imposition.
8. The grounds of appeal refer to other garages in front of the building line, but these are not in Atheling Road and have no bearing on my assessment of the appeal scheme on its individual merits.
9. I have noted the appellant's comment that the occupiers of No. 14 do not object to the proposal and taken this into account. However, it is also apparent that a number of other residents of Atheling Road have similar reservations to those of the Council and by and large I agree with the comments they have made.
10. My overall conclusion is that the proposed garage would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street scene of Atheling Road. This would conflict with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest Outside the National Park 2009 and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
11. The application includes a car port along the north eastern flank of the dwelling. I note that this has not been referred to in the Council's Notice of Refusal, but in the absence of further details and representations by the appeal parties I shall leave it to the Council to inform the appellant as to whether an application for retrospective permission is needed.
12. For the reasons explained above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR