



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 MAY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/25/3360193

88 Bursledon Road, Hedge End, Hampshire SO30 0BZ

- 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 & Mrs Davison against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/24/98536.
 - The development proposed is install a two car carport in space at the front of the property.
-

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 comprises a modern two-storey dwelling with attached garage forming part of a small, linear residential development accessed from Bursledon Road. The properties are in an elevated position from the road and the appeal site is the end dwelling. Properties along Bursledon Road vary in age, style, materials and positioning relative to the road, but the majority are set back with outbuildings positioned to the side.
4. The site is located within the character area of Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB 29) identified in the Character Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This identifies Bursledon Road as being heavily trafficked and states new development should mitigate the effects of the heavy traffic by using measures such as boundary planting and setbacks and the materials proposed should complement/be similar to the existing development.
5. The proposal is for a double carport located forward of the main dwelling at the front corner of the appeal site. The carport would be enclosed on three sides with a gable facing the road. The location of the development would make it unduly prominent in the street scene and this does not comply with the SPD which requires new development to be setback from the road. The hedging on the site boundary is insufficient to provide adequate screening to either soften the appearance of the development or mitigate its visual impact in the street scene. Although there is a tree located outside the site that would provide some natural screening, this would only be in the summer months when the tree is in leaf. The materials proposed would be complementary to the existing dwelling but the gable roof design would add bulk and mass to the carport, exacerbating its prominence.

6. In conclusion, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) which seeks to ensure, amongst other things that new development does not have an unacceptable impact on and where possible enhances the character and appearance of urban areas.

Other Matters

7. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to other examples of outbuildings positioned forward of the dwelling on Bursledon Road. The detached outbuildings identified at 151 and 80 Bursledon Road are garages located forward of the host dwellings with pitched and hipped roofs sloping away from the street which minimises the bulk and mass of the developments. The outbuilding at No 80 is also set behind substantial screening. I do not know the full details of the circumstances that led to planning permission being granted for these outbuildings and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal and in any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
8. The appellant also provides examples of attached double garages forward of the main dwelling with barn hipped roofs, but as they are attached to the dwelling with different roof forms, they are not comparable to the appeal proposal. The other examples of outbuildings provided form part of a different character area against which they would have been assessed.
9. I acknowledge the appellants concerns over the Council's handling of the application, particularly with regard to working proactively with the applicants. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under a Section 78 planning appeal.
10. I note the lack of objections to the proposed development, but this is neutral in the consideration of the appeal and the absence of objection does not equate to the lack of harm.
11. The appellants submitted a revised set of plans with their appeal Statement of Case offering a reduced ridge line and hipped roof and suggested additional planting. However, I am mindful that the appeals process should not be used to evolve a scheme to overcome the Local Planning Authority's reasons for refusal and instead a fresh planning application should usually be made.¹

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR

¹ Annex M of the Procedural Guide Planning Appeals – England advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought.