
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/19/3230376

10 Laburnum Grove, Eastleigh, SO50 9DJ

- 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 B Randall against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/19/84999, dated 18 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as '*Erection of a 1.5 storey extension replacing a rundown garage and garden shed at ground floor with a new annex/bedroom at first floor; providing accommodation for an ill family member*'.
-

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 property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof and located within a residential area comprising other similar style properties amongst its mix. Together with its attached neighbour at No 8, it is set at an angle across its corner location at a wide road junction where Laburnum Grove bisects Toynbee Road. As a result of its position, the appeal site has a triangular shape with a wide frontage and atypically large amount of space to the side of the dwelling, but with an extremely short and tapering rear garden. There is a single, detached garage to the side of the dwelling that is recessed behind its front elevation, and a small 'workshop' shed to the side of that. The proposal is to replace the side garage and workshop with a 1½-storey side extension that would include accommodation within the roof at first floor level with a forward-facing dormer window, and with a further single-storey projection to the side.
4. Despite its position, the forwardmost corner of the existing dwelling approximately aligns with the forward building line of the neighbouring semi-detached pair at Nos 32 and 34 Toynbee Road. This allows the eye to

comfortably turn the corner from Laburnum Grove into Toynbee Road without any visual disruption. Although the recessed positions of the buildings to the properties in the immediate area are not consistent to each side of the roads around this junction, there is largely some level of consistency to the alignment of buildings that radiate from it such that they create a uniformity to the pattern of development within the street scene. This remains true even for 12 Laburnum Grove, which has been extended in a very similar fashion to the appeal property. No 12 has a rectangular shaped plot with a more conventionally arranged frontage to Laburnum Grove and return frontage to Toynbee Road. Although its side extension has obviously narrowed the gap with the boundary to Toynbee Road, I saw that the new side flank wall to this dwelling aligns with the front elevations of Nos 27 and 29 Toynbee Road such that the vista along the street scene is uniform.

5. In contrast to this, the sideways extension of No 10 would project the dwelling closer to Toynbee Road, but also significantly forward of the established building line. The extension would stand proud in the street scene, and would appear as an obvious visual incursion, especially at first floor level, out of keeping with the established grain and pattern of development in the area. I accept that the proposed works would relate well to the appearance of No 10, and that when seen in isolation, they would appear as an appropriate subservient addition. But when viewed within its wider context, I find that the extension would appear incongruous and intrusive, disruptive to the visual harmony and spatial characteristics of the street scene. In this regard there would be conflict with the broad guidelines contained within the Council's *Quality Places* Supplementary Planning Document 2011 as it relates to the contextual analysis for new development, and the design criteria of saved policy 59.BE of the Local Plan Review 2001-2011. For these same reasons it would also conflict with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework for achieving well-designed places.
6. I appreciate that the appellant has carefully considered the constraints and opportunities of the site, and that there would remain adequate space to park cars on the plot's frontage, with added benefit of a slightly enlarged rear garden. I am also aware of the fact that additional space is required for a relative in need of care, which is supported in principle by policies within the Council's emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036. However, when weighed in the overall balance, these factors do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area, and conflict with policies of the adopted development plan and national policy.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR