



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 August 2021

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/21/3270333

Five Pines, 35 Pine Road, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh SO53 1LF

- 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 Simon Whitcher against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/20/89205, dated 3 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension and entrance porch at Five Pines, 35 Pine Road, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh SO53 1LF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref H/20/89205, dated 3 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved drawing: Dwg No 01 revision D.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 4. No excavation, demolition or development related works shall take place on site until a scaled and referenced tree protection plan, as per British Standard 5837:2012 (Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations) (or an equivalent British Standard if revised or replaced), is submitted and approved by the LPA. The approved development must be carried out in accordance with the approved tree protection plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a detached two storey property located on the southern side of Pine Road. This part of the street contains a mix of bungalows and two storey properties within equally proportioned plots. These dwellings incorporate a variety of designs and shapes ranging from modest bungalows to large two storey dwellings. In contrast, the northern frontage has a stronger rhythm and uniformity between the dwellings in terms of their appearance, scale and alignment. Nonetheless the street's architectural variety combined with the

- many trees and attractive front gardens contribute positively to the area's character.
4. The proposed side extension would incorporate a large two storey gable and a first-floor front dormer window that would mirror those features on the existing front elevation. There would also be a continuation of the dwelling's roof form with the inclusion of a catslide roof element on the front elevation, while the overall height of the dwelling would be maintained. These changes along with the central porch would give the dwelling a balanced and symmetrical appearance that would architecturally be in keeping with the design and scale of nearby dwellings, particularly those larger properties to the west of No 57 Pine Road.
 5. The proposal, according to the Council, would double the size of the host dwelling. Yet, from my site inspection, it would not appear prominent in the street as it would be set back within the plot and largely screened to the west by Nos 37 and 39 Pine Road. Moreover, the tall stand of mature evergreen trees that line the property's roadside boundary would partially screen the altered dwelling's front elevation when approaching from the east, ensuring it would not appear visually intrusive when viewed from this vantage point.
 6. The Council has raised concerns that the proposal's mass and design would be inconsistent with the appearance and scale of the street's many bungalows. I noted during my site visit a sequence of similar bungalows extending from No 36-62 (evens) along Pine Road's northern frontage. However, there is no obvious consistency in dwelling size on the opposite side of the road where the appeal property sits. Here dwellings include a variety of single and two storey properties and it is not uncommon to see these house types side by side.
 7. There are further concerns that the increase in the appeal dwelling's scale would amount to overdevelopment of the site. However, the property would retain its large front garden and forecourt area, while the proposed works would not displace any of the rear amenity space. I am therefore satisfied that the space around the dwelling would be largely retained, such that there would be no unacceptable overdevelopment of the plot.
 8. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and Draft Policy DM1 of the Emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036). These policies, amongst other things require proposals to be appropriate in terms of mass, scale and design and not have an unacceptable impact on the area's character and appearance.
 9. I have considered the Council's proposed conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary to impose a condition to identify the approved plans in the interest of precision. A condition in respect of materials is necessary in the interest of character and appearance. Although the Council has indicated there would be no harm to the protected trees along the property's frontage, it is considered necessary that a tree protection plan is submitted to safeguard the trees from any damage during construction works.
 10. For the above reasons I allow the appeal subject to the above conditions.

R E Jones

INSPECTOR