



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/25/3361538

5 Warwick Close, Chandler's Ford, Hampshire SO53 4PH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Crawford against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 24/02318/FULLS.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey side garage extension, garage door on the front and a door exiting into the back garden with a lean-to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side garage extension, garage door on the front and a door exiting into the back garden with a lean-to roof at 5 Warwick Close, Chandler's Ford, Hampshire SO53 4PH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 24/02318/FULLS, and the plans submitted with it, with no conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is retrospective in nature with the garage having been substantially completed at the time of my site visit, and which appeared to have been broadly constructed in accordance with the submitted drawings.
3. Since the planning application, the subject of this appeal was determined, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') has been published (12 December 2024) and consequently amended on 7 February 2025. There has been no material change to national planning policy in respect of householder appeals and therefore I considered that it was not necessary to refer back to the parties. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon highway safety; and upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated within a residential cul-de-sac with a relatively narrow carriageway width and limited footways. There are no parking restrictions within the street and it appears that some residents are reliant upon on-street parking to some degree.

6. A narrow garage has been constructed to the side of the house and this has not been built to the dimensions necessary to meet the Council's Adopted Parking Standards. There is a driveway space in front of the garage, and at the time of my site visit, a second car was parked at right-angles to it on a small section of footway that terminates at the front garden of the appeal dwelling.
7. The appellant stipulates that the garage is required to accommodate a future motorbike, having had his previous one stolen from the property and I have been given no reason to doubt this. However, the occupation of dwellings is transitory and therefore the needs of future occupants must also be taken into account.
8. Notwithstanding this, I note that Hampshire County Council as Local Highway Authority (LHA), acknowledge that the proposal results in the loss of a parking space meaning that the existing dwelling is under-provided by one space. However, the LHA has undertaken a site visit and stipulates that Warwick Close was moderately parked during their site visit with parking occurring predominantly within the associated visitor's bays and the highway, which broadly reflects my own observations.
9. The LHA go on to state that overspill opportunities within Warwick Close could take place without major issue and they consider the potential for an additional car being parked on the highway would not have a significant impact in reality. Whilst they make reference to a possible solution mooted by the appellant to hardsurface the existing front garden area to which they raised no objection, its implementation does not appear to be straight forward as some of that space constitutes highway verge and would need to be narrowed /extinguished to some extent.
10. The local planning authority disagrees with the comments of the Highways Officer, however with respect, Hampshire County Council are a statutory consultee whose specific remit, as LHA, is to consider matters of highway safety. In the absence of an objection by them to the proposal, and noting that it is possible to park a second car across the end of the existing driveway outside of the carriageway, I conclude, on balance, that there would be no detrimental impact upon the accessibility, function or character of the local highway network; also bearing in mind that no footways exist within the Close once past the appeal site.
11. Therefore, notwithstanding that the garage does not comply with the minimum internal dimensions as required by Policy T2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) (RLP) I find no direct conflict between the proposal and RLP Policy T1 which, amongst other things, permits development, provided it does not have an adverse impact on the function, safety and character of and accessibility to the local highway network.
12. I note the Council's concerns with regard to the visual implications of on-street parking within the estate, however, by virtue of the layout and the result of modern-day living with contemporary levels of car ownership, such visual implications are unavoidable. I find no direct conflict between the proposal and RLP Policy COM2 which simply stipulates that within the boundaries of settlements, the principle of development and redevelopment will be permitted provided that it is appropriate to the other policies of the Revised Local Plan.
13. In respect of RLP Policy E1, the design of the garage itself appears to be of a high quality and integrates with, and complements the character of the area in which it is located in terms of layout, appearance, scale, materials and building style. Further,

based upon the comments of the LHA and my own conclusions, I consider that the character, function and quality of the area would not be harmed by the proposal; therefore overall I consider that the scheme would not give rise to harm to highway safety or to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. The Council has not suggested that any conditions be imposed and by virtue of the retrospective nature of the proposal which is substantially complete, I consider that no conditions are necessary.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR