
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/16/3159568
12 Burns Road, Eastleigh SO50 5DT

- 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 Mrs V Allen against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: F/16/78697 dated 6 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension at 12 Burns Road, Eastleigh SO50 5DT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: F/16/78697 dated 6 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 1892/06_01_A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace, two-storey dwelling which has been previously extended, fronting Burns Road with a side return to Burns Close, within a predominantly residential area. The immediate local area mainly comprises short terraces of two storey dwellings together with some semi-detached properties. The siting of the appeal property within its plot and the end of terrace dwelling on the opposite (south) side of the junction of Burns Road with Burns Close, provides a sense of spaciousness within the street scene.
-

4. The single storey side extension would be set in by 0.91m from the side boundary and set back from the front elevation of the existing property. It would not extend the full length of the property as extended. It would have a hipped roof which would be some 4m at its highest apex, where it joins the existing property.
5. I consider that the scale of the proposed extension, including its siting and design with its hipped roof would result in a side extension which would appear subservient to the main dwelling. Given its scale in relation to the existing dwelling and the overall plot, and in particular the hipped roof design, I am also satisfied that it would not be visually obtrusive and would not be overly prominent in the street scene. I also consider that given its scale and massing it would not materially detract from the sense of spaciousness which is a feature of the street scene at the junction of Burns Road with Burns Close.
6. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extension would respect the street scene. It would not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011) both of which, amongst other things, seek a high standard of design which respects the local context. Although not referenced in the reason for refusal, I have also had regard to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents: *Quality Places* and *Character Area Appraisals*, within which the appeal site forms part of ELAC19. I am satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with the findings and guidance in either of these documents.
7. I am advised that there have been a number of refusals for both two storey and single storey side extensions to the property, which have been upheld at appeal as well as a more recent permission from the Council for a single storey side extension with a hipped roof which would be slightly smaller in its width and height than the proposal before me (F/16/77804). I have been provided with the scheme plan for the permission granted by the Council which also indicates the scale of an earlier and larger single storey extension which was dismissed at appeal. I have taken these earlier decisions into account in so far as the information has been made available to me, but the proposal before me would appear to be materially different from those the subject of refusals, both by the Council and at appeal.
8. I have noted the neighbour's concerns regarding parking pressures and highway safety, but do not consider that the proposal would materially impact on available parking spaces or raise concerns related to highway safety. The Council has also raised no issue in these regards.
9. In terms of conditions, matching materials with the existing dwelling are required in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. I shall also add a condition to list the approved plan for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR