
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/19/3239807

1 Oakwood Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh SO53 1LW

- 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 Shanker against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/19/85885, dated 17 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is originally described as the "proposed demolition of the existing bungalow and erection of a six bed replacement dwelling".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has submitted a set of revised plans in response to the Council's reasons for refusal. The revised plans include a new hedgerow along Hiltingbury Road and the proposed development, a reduction in height of the proposed garage, and redesigned first floor windows facing Oakwood Road to match the ground floor windows. These amendments do not materially alter the overall proposal and as such would not prejudice any interested parties. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal based on plan numbers 4104-P-01, 4104-P-02 (Rev C), and 4104-P-03 (Rev A).
3. The Council's decision notice refers to the Eastleigh Borough Local Plans for both 2011-2029 and 2016-2036, but does not list any specific policies. The Council's delegated report and submitted policy documents refer to Policy DM1 of each respective Local Plan, which have therefore formed the basis for my determination of this appeal. I note further that both Local Plans are currently under examination and as such can only be afforded limited weight in my decision.
4. The Council's decision notice also refers to the Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Both parties state that this SPD was adopted in 2008, however the SPD documents provided show that it was adopted on January 2005. I have therefore based my assessment on the submitted SPD adopted in January 2005.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard for Oakwood Road.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a large residential plot prominently located on the corner of Oakwood Road and Hiltingbury Road. The appeal site currently comprises of a single storey dwelling with a generous rear garden area. The design, layout and appearance of the existing dwelling and appeal site more closely relates to the development along Oakwood Road than with development along Hiltingbury Road. Oakwood Road is characterised by a mix of single and two storey detached dwellings, which although varied in design form a cohesive pattern of development with a spacious vegetated setting. Hiltingbury Road comparatively comprises significantly larger dwellings which generally juxtapose with the appeal site and scale of development along Oakwood Road.
7. The appeal proposal seeks to demolish the existing single storey dwelling and replace it with a significantly larger two storey family dwelling. Although the existing dwelling could be described as making a modest contribution to the Oakwood Road street scene, it does adhere to the prevailing characteristics along Oakwood Road by maintaining a consistent building design, footprint and layout which generally aligns with the predominant development pattern. The proposed dwelling would conversely have a larger building footprint that unduly expands beyond the predominant rear building line along Oakwood Road and closer towards the Hiltingbury Road frontage, disrupting the cohesive pattern of development along Oakwood Road.
8. The design of the proposed dwelling would also detrimentally increase the physical bulk, scale and massing of development on the site contrary to the built form character along Oakwood Road. The principle elevations and roof line of the of the proposed dwelling lack meaningful variation in their design, in terms of punctuation or articulation, which would cumulatively achieve an unpleasantly bulky and dominant appearance. This is further exacerbated when considering the prominent location of the appeal site on the corner of Oakwood Road and Hiltingbury Road, and the siting of the proposal closer to the Hiltingbury Road street scene with little activation of this frontage.
9. I note the appellant's favourable comparison of the appeal proposal to the existing dwelling located on the opposite corner of the Oakwood Road and Hiltingbury Road junction. However, I do not consider the appeal proposal to be comparable as the existing corner dwelling opposite the appeal site successfully reduces the physical bulk and massing of the dwelling from both street scenes, with punctuated recesses in the building façade, articulation in the roof design and a greater setback from Hiltingbury Road. Although the proposed hedgerow along Hiltingbury Road and reduced height of the proposed garage would soften the interface of the proposed development to Hiltingbury Road, it would not adequately address the siting, design and massing harm identified.
10. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard for Oakwood Road. It would conflict with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) (adopted May 2006), Policy DM1 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (submitted for examination 2014), Policy DM1 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (submitted for examination October 2018), the Quality Places SPD (adopted

November 2011) and the Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas SPD. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of a high quality design and does not have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR