

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 February 2021

by Mr Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/20/3263525

2 Lincolnshire Road, WATERLOOVILLE, PO7 7FD

- 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 Joshua Lee-Bapty against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01549/HOU, dated 21 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "we wish to change the area outside the front door from tarmac to turf with a 1m iron fence around with a gate, identical to every other property around."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of the area outside the front door from tarmac to turf with a 1m iron fence around with a gate at 2 Lincolnshire Road, Waterlooville, PO7 7FD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01549/HOU, dated 21 July 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development as stated on the planning application form, however in the formal decision above I have omitted extraneous words from the description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal scheme proposes the enclosure of a small area of land outside of the front door to the property. Currently the area is laid to tarmac and is open to the footway. Many of the properties within the area have frontages that are enclosed by metal fencing and brick upstands. While the appeal property appears to be a maisonette above garages, it shares a close affinity with properties with enclosed fronts. I observed that a similar property above garages in proximity to the site has a landscaped area outside of its front door.

There were also areas of landscaping within the immediate vicinity, including areas both enclosed by timber fencing and not so.

5. Within this context, the addition of an enclosed area to the front of the appeal property would not be an incongruous feature. It would not appear unduly isolated, particularly in light of the nearby landscaped areas, and given the variety in frontage treatment that is present would not unacceptably disturb the rhythm of built form along the street.
6. Accordingly, there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area and the scheme would accord with policies DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (2017), insofar as they seek to ensure development respects the features and characteristics that contribute to local distinctiveness and that development responds positively to the character and variety of the local environment.

Conditions

7. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans. The Council have also suggested a condition that materials should match the existing building. As the scheme is for a grassed area and fence, there are no equivalent elements on the appeal property and as such, this condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR