
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/21/3280266

31 Yoells Lane, Lovedean, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 9SR

- 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 Stephen Pound against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 58812/001, dated 14 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is detached car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The car port has been erected and I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.
3. The description of development in the heading above is taken from the appeal form and decision notice, since it more precisely describes the appeal scheme than the description on the planning application form. I have omitted "*retrospective application*" since this does not form part of the development.
4. Since the refusal of the planning application, a revised version of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. I have taken this into account where relevant to my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property comprises a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling located on the north side of Yoells Lane, within an established suburban housing area. This side of the road, between the junctions with Frogmore Lane and Loxwood Road, has a clearly distinguishable character, comprising two-storey predominantly brick-walled houses with pitched tiled roofs. They are positioned behind open plan frontages, which are laid out as forecourt parking or soft landscaping.
7. Apart from a detached property at No.47, which has a flat-roofed garage to its side, the properties were constructed with integral garages. In the case of the two groups of terraced houses, one of which includes the appeal site, these

garages, together with front porches, protrude in front of the buildings in the form of flat-roofed single storey projections. In the case of the semi-detached properties at Nos 43 – 45, and No 47, these projections are narrower, just comprising the porches. In each case, the front projection comprises a shallow, subservient front addition.

8. Having regard to the above, there is a high degree of cohesiveness of built development along this part of the street, and an open and spacious townscape. This character extends to properties to the north of the site in Elmeswelle Road, and forms a significant townscape element of the wider housing area. During my site inspection I did not observe any other examples of detached pitched roof outbuildings located at the front of properties which exhibit these townscape characteristics, and no evidence of such structures has been brought to my attention.
9. The appeal scheme is at odds with this established pattern of built development. Although the car port is constructed in similar brick and tile materials to those of the terraced housing in this part of the street, the pitched roof is out of keeping with the flat-roofed nature of the garages and porches which characterises the dwelling frontages. The car port roof sits awkwardly in relation to the flat-roofed structure at the front of the appeal property, both in terms of its eaves and ridge heights, and its perpendicular positioning in relation to this structure. Moreover, the brick-pillared design, incorporating open areas to the sides and rear of the car port, differs significantly from the enclosed nature of the other front protrusions in this part of the street. This serves to further draw attention to the appeal scheme.
10. Whilst the appeal property and the adjacent property at No.33 are set back further from the street than the adjacent terraced properties to both sides, the appeal scheme still projects notably in front of the building line of the adjacent dwellings. It significantly erodes the spacious open area to the front of the property, which is a positive feature of this open plan part of the street.
11. As such, the proposal appears as unduly visually intrusive within the street scene and draws the eye as an incongruous feature within the prevailing townscape character of this side of the road.
12. The boundary fence and hedge along the side of the site with No.29, together with the closer positioning of Nos.27 and 29 to the road than the appeal site, and the higher ground level of these properties in relation to the appeal site, mean that the car port is partially screened in views from the west. However, the pitched roof remains visible above the fence line and appears incongruous in relation to the adjacent flat-roofed porches on No.29 and the appeal property.
13. I have noted the appellant's intention to retain the tree at the front of the site. This currently provides some screening of the car port, albeit that the height of its canopy above ground level reduces its screening effect. However, the appeal scheme remains highly visible within the townscape, particularly when approaching the site from the east, and when directly facing the site from the road. This is in part due to the open plan nature of this side of the road, and also due to rising ground levels between the appeal site frontage and front wall of the dwelling, and in a westerly direction along this part of the road, so that the appeal scheme has an elevated siting in relation to the site frontage and neighbouring properties to the east.

14. Moreover, notwithstanding the appellant's proposed planning condition to secure the retention of the tree, I cannot be certain that the tree would remain, and this is not a reason to allow development of an inappropriate design for its surroundings.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal scheme causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is therefore contrary to Policy CP29 of the *East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy* (2014) and the *Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document* (2018). These policies and guidance, amongst other aims, require new development to seek exemplary standards of design, respect the area's particular characteristics, ensure that the layout and design contributes to local distinctiveness and is appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of its relationship to adjoining buildings, and that, in general, outbuildings are situated in an inconspicuous position when viewed from the public realm and garages are set back from the main building line.
16. For similar reasons, the proposal would also be contrary to Policies of the Framework which seek to secure well-designed places as set out in Chapter 12.

Other Matters

17. I acknowledge that the appellant built the appeal scheme on the understanding that it was considered to be permitted development. However, I must deal with the appeal on the merits of the scheme before me, and the fact that the structure has been completed does not justify or outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue.
18. I have also noted that the appellant previously parked a large white caravan in the position of the appeal development. Whilst this may have been highly visible in the street scene, this does not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

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

S Leonard

INSPECTOR