



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2019

by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/19/3235340

6 Coultas Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh S053 5BB

- 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 Kevin McColl against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/19/85162, dated 24 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a wooden carport enclosed on three sides (no doors) of dimensions 6m depth by 5m wide, with an eaves height of no more than 2.4m and a ridge height of no more than 3.7m. The new construction would be at least 3m from the property's front boundary, on the right hand side of the driveway as you look at the property from the road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area including protected trees.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in a verdant residential area characterised by detached houses set back from the street with spacious and landscaped front gardens. There is a consistent pattern of development along Coultas Road with properties following a common building line. The presence of buildings to the front of properties is uncommon and does not follow the established pattern of development in Coultas Road.
4. The proposed wooden carport would be situated in a prominent position to the front of the appeal property. It would appear as an incongruent feature not characteristic of surrounding development and departing from the pattern of development along Coultas Road. The Eastleigh Borough Council Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD) advises that ancillary buildings such as garages should be sympathetically related to the main dwelling and in normal circumstances garages should be in line with or be behind the front of the house. The proposal does not adhere to this guiding principle.

5. By virtue of the siting of the proposed car port to the front of the dwelling, the introduction of built form to the front of the property contrary to the pattern of development would not respect the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would cause harm to it. Although I note the suggestion that the continuation of a wall and planting of bushes could be used to provide additional screening, this would not adequately mitigate the harm to the street scene or the established character of the area surrounding the site.
6. The large oak within the front garden of the property is protected by a Tree Preservation Order. It is a prominent feature along Coultas Road and forms part of a network of trees and landscaping that makes an important contribution to the local landscape character of the area. The proposed development being located within the Root Protection Zone of this protected tree has the potential to cause harm to it. Whilst a tree survey has been undertaken, in the absence of a detailed arboricultural report to assess the impact of the development on the tree there is not sufficient information to demonstrate that no harm would occur. Damage to the tree may ultimately lead to its loss and this would add to the harm arising from the unsympathetic siting of the carport forward of the dwelling.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to garages forward of dwellings elsewhere in the wider area, including one at 16 Sherwood Road and a carport at 51 Pine Road. I do not know the full background to these, or whether the tree in the case of 51 Pine Road is a protected specimen. Nevertheless, the examples are not reflective of the prevailing character of Coultas Road and their existence does not persuade me that the proposal is acceptable. I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It also cannot be demonstrated that the proposal would not result in harm to protected trees. Thus, the proposal would conflict with saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and the SPD. Together these seek that development takes account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the area and are appropriate in layout and siting both in themselves and in relation to trees worthy of retention. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in seeking to ensure that proposals are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Stephen Thomas

INSPECTOR