



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/21/3287497

235 London Road, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 0HN

- 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 Alex Cole against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22617/009, dated 29 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is new detached garage (resubmission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 site is located on the western side of London Road and comprises a modern two storey detached property with a garden to the rear and a front garden that is largely set aside for parking. The properties to the north and south of the appeal site vary in terms of their form, mass and style and include a mixture of detached and semi-detached bungalows and chalet bungalows.
4. A particular characteristic of the host property and the properties to the north and south is that they are set back some distance from the back edge of the pavement with their frontages, other than that on the appeal site, made up of low boundary walls and hedging. Opposite the appeal site is a large band of mature trees and landscaping that extends along the whole length of this section of London Road.
5. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a large single storey garage within the frontage to the host property. The proposed ground floor plan indicates that the new building would be set back approximately 1 metre from the existing front boundary wall and would adjoin the common boundary with No. 237 London Road. It would, therefore, be sited well in front of the building line that is formed by the host and immediate properties on this section of road, No's. 223 – 241 (odd) London Road.
6. Within the above context, the proposed building would occupy a prominent location and would be highly visible. It would appear completely out of keeping

with its immediate context and would fail to respond positively to the prevailing built form and open character of the frontages to No's 223 – 241 (odd). There are no other similar outbuildings within this section of London Road and as I confirmed above, there is a well established building line formed by No's 223 – 241 (odd).

7. Whilst there is an existing brick wall enclosing most of the frontage to the appeal site, which extends along its side (return) boundaries, the eaves and ridge height of the proposed building are such that the garage would still be highly visible within the streetscene. As I observed on my site visit, the existing boundary wall would not completely screen the proposed building and a large part of it would be visible from the road dominating the open frontages of the appeal site and adjoining properties. It would result in a marked change in the appearance and character of this part of the streetscene where no similar outbuildings or garages currently exist.
8. The Appellant refers to the use of materials to match existing and a hipped roof design to reduce the scale of the proposed building. However, these considerations do not outweigh the findings I have reached above or mitigate against the harm I have identified. Reference has also been made to other outbuildings and garages in the surrounding area. However, these are not comparable in that they are not visible from the appeal site, and thus do not form part of its local context. Moreover, I do not know the full planning circumstances of these cases and have, as is required, considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits with particular regard to the circumstances of the case, specifically the impact of the proposed building on the character and appearance of this section of London Road.
9. The Appellant has also referred to the requirement within the East Hampshire District Council: Residential Extensions & Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD), for extensions and outbuildings to be subservient and for materials to match existing. Whilst this advice is provided in paragraph 3.1, dealing with Garges and Outbuildings, paragraph 3.2 continues by stating that outbuildings should be located in an inconspicuous position and will rarely be acceptable when sited in front of an existing property, as it would not appear subservient to the host property and would conflict with established building lines. This advice supports the findings I have reached above.
10. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would be contrary to policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014), the relevant guidance of the SPD and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021). All of these policies seek, amongst other requirements, to ensure that new development respects and is sympathetic to local character including its relationship to existing buildings and spaces.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR