

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/21/3285238
307 Hursley Road, Chandler's Ford SO53 5PJ

- 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 Broadribb against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/21/90793, dated 7 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a carport at 307 Hursley Road, Chandler's Ford SO53 5PJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref H/21/90793, dated 7 June 2021, subject to the conditions set out below:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise in complete accordance with the approved plans: 610.1/07/100, 610.1/07/101, 610.1/07/102 and 610.1/07/103.
 3. The tiles to be used in the construction of the roof of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling; and the external walls shall be clad in timber.
 4. Notwithstanding the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement, no development above slab level shall take place on site until a revised Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan (in accordance with BS5837:2012) is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a well established residential area of an Arcadian nature, generally comprising large detached dwellings within generous

plots. Many trees within the locality are protected by Tree Preservation Orders including a number within the frontage of the appeal site and of those dwellings adjacent, at 4 Rothville Place to the north and 305 Hursley Road to the south.

4. I note from the planning history pertaining to the appeal site that planning permission was granted in April 2021 for a carport, pursuant to Ref. H/20/88615 and which was reasonably similar to the proposal that is before me, with the exception that no office accommodation was to be provided within the roof space. The appellant stipulates that the ridgeline over the extant permission has increased by 1.3m whereas the Council states this to be 1.5m. The submitted plans have not been provided with annotated dimensions, nonetheless even if the Council's measurement is correct, I consider that the difference of 0.2m would not be significant.
5. In considering the proposals I note that the roof pitch would be of a traditional angle and overall the subject building would be designed in a sympathetic manner with the use of natural finishing materials. Consequently I consider that the overall height, scale and massing of the proposed outbuilding would not be unduly prominent within the street scene, having regard to the fact that the Council previously approved a not too dissimilar building within the same location. Overall it would constitute an appropriate architectural solution particularly bearing in mind the fall-back position.
6. Following on from the above, whilst clearly there would be an increase in height of the proposed building over that previously approved, the footprint and the general form of construction would be very similar. The trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders most likely to be affected by the proposal comprise trees T6 (Oak) and T7 (Horse Chestnut). The Oak tree would be the closest to the proposed building and whilst I note that the Arboricultural Report was not updated for this appeal proposal, nonetheless the crown of this tree is quite high and the branches of it are unlikely to be affected. However, taking a precautionary approach, I consider that it is necessary to require further details to be submitted prior to the commencement of the development above slab level to be sure that the crown of the tree would not be harmed by the proposal.
7. I consider that the proposed structure would still be fairly well screened by mature trees and other vegetation within the front garden scene, and in totality the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. I find that the proposal complies with Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2001 – 2011) and Draft Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036) which together require development proposals to take full and proper account of the context of the site, including the character and appearance of the locality, are appropriate in mass, scale and materials, layout, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, natural features and trees worthy of retention.
8. Notwithstanding the advice of the Council's Quality Spaces SPD that the position of external garages should take account of local context and that they will only be built in the front of sites in exceptional circumstances, having regard to the history of the site and the extant planning permission, I conclude no significant harm would ensue from the proposal.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
10. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council recommends that conditions are imposed that require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that the roofing materials match those used on the host dwelling with the elevations to be clad in timber. I consider that these conditions are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, along with the Council's recommended condition that a revised Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan be submitted so as to be certain that no harm would be caused to the protected trees.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR