

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by Martin Small, BA (Hons), BPI, DipCM, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH JULY 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/20/3252769

22 Maypole Villas, Eastleigh, SO50 4LN

- 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 Mrs Imogen Wigley against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: H/20/87334 dated 6 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's reason for refusal refers to Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (SEBLP). From the evidence before me, the Examination of this Plan is still underway. Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) explains that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan, the extent to which there are unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the Framework.
3. Although the SEBLP has reached an advanced stage in its preparation the independent examination has yet to be concluded. The consistency of Policy DM1 with the Framework is a matter for the examining Inspector and I have not been advised whether or not there are any unresolved objections to this policy. I therefore give only moderate weight to this emerging policy in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and on the street scene of Maypole Villas.

Reasons

5. Maypole Villas is a cul-de-sac that rises from its entrance to a loop at its end with a grassed 'island' in the middle of the loop. The dwellings in the road are semi-detached and set back with large open frontages used as gardens, lawns or hard standings for vehicles. I observed during my site visit that other than the 2-storey front extension to No. 20 Maypole Villas, there is a general absence of substantial projections beyond the front elevations of the other properties in the cul-de-sac, the majority of which have characteristic simple,

- uncluttered front elevations. The large detached double garage of No. 27 Maypole Villas does not project significantly beyond the front elevation of the neighbouring property, No. 26.
6. Furthermore, the majority of the properties have medium-height fences or walls to their front boundaries or are open to the highway. The combination of these features gives the cul-de-sac a reasonably spacious character and contributes positively to its appearance.
 7. Although reduced in size from a previous proposal, for which planning permission was also refused, the proposed garage would occupy a substantial proportion of the frontage of the appeal property. The resulting reduction in the openness of the frontage would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the cul-de-sac.
 8. The garage would be visible when entering and from within the cul-de-sac. Although, due to the staggered layout of the dwellings and the front extension to No. 20, the garage would be seen in the context of existing development, it would be prominent and incongruous. It would dominate and detract from the characteristic simplicity of the front elevation of the dwelling. The proposed garage would also unbalance the appearance of the host dwelling and its partner, No. 21 Maypole Villas.
 9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and to the street scene of Maypole Villas. The extension to No. 20 and the double garage to No. 27 are not sufficient, individually or in combination, to set a precedent for the development proposed.
 10. Accordingly, in this respect, the proposal would be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and emerging Policy DM1 of the SEBLP, which, amongst other things, seek to protect the character and appearance of a locality. The proposal would also fail to comply in this respect with paragraph 127 of the Framework which, amongst other things, requires planning decisions to ensure that developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.
 11. The development would not fully comply with the guidance set out for Character Area ELAC1, in which the appeal property is located, in the Character Area Appraisals Eastleigh Supplementary Planning Document to retain and extend the continuity in the building line. This is notwithstanding that as the pattern of development in Maypole Villas is staggered, the continuity of the building line is limited to each pair of semi-detached dwellings.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR