

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/16/3161650

7 Knyght Close, Romsey SO51 5UX

- 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 Baker against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01788/FULLS, dated 22 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension and a part two storey and a part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension and a part two storey and a part single storey side extension at 7 Knyght Close, Romsey SO51 5UX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01788/FULLS, dated 22 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100 – Site Location Plan; 101 – Ground Floor Plan Existing; 102 – First Floor Plan Existing; 103 – Roof Plan Existing; 120 – Block Plan Existing; 150 – Front Elevation Existing; 151 – Rear Elevation Existing; 152 – Side Elevation 01 Existing; 153 – Side Elevation 02 Existing, 200 – Block Plan Proposed; 201 – Ground Floor Plan Proposed; 202 Revision 05 – First Floor Plan Proposed; 203 – Roof Plan Proposed; 250 – Front Elevation Proposed; 251 – Rear Elevation Proposed; 252 Revision 05 – Side Elevation 01 Proposed; and 253 – Side Elevation 02 Proposed.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, including dormer windows, other than those shown on the drawings hereby permitted shall be inserted into the eastern elevation of the two storey side extension.
-

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Alex Baker against Test Valley Borough Council. That application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The application was amended prior to its determination by the Council, with a window in the first floor side elevation having been deleted. That amendment is shown on drawings 202 Revision 05 (first floor plan [proposed]) and 252 Revision 05 (side elevation 01 [proposed]) and I have therefore had regard to those amended plans in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of 7 Knyght Close (No 7) and Knyght Close.

Reasons

5. The development would involve the construction of a part single and a part two storey side extension (the side extension) and a single storey front extension. The Council has raised no objection to the scale or appearance of the front extension and I see no reason to take a contrary view. My reasoning below therefore relates to the side extension.
6. Although the side extension would significantly elongate No 7's front and rear elevations and add mass to this property I consider the mixed roof forms, hipped end with front gable for the two storey element and mono-pitch to the single storey element, would provide interest and help to limit the mass of No 7 as extended. I therefore find that the side extension would not be an incongruous addition to No 7 and would be respectful of the character and appearance of this property.
7. While the side extension would be a comparatively large addition and the north eastern corners of both of its single and two storey elements would be hard up against the boundary No 7 shares with the rear gardens of 23 and 25 Wills Way, this addition would not have a prominent siting within the streetscene. That is because No 7 occupies a corner position within a cul-de-sac spur, with the result that only very oblique views of the side extension would be possible in the space between Nos 7 and 8.
8. Some views of the side extension would be possible via the gap between Nos 9 and 10, however, those views would be quite distant and I consider that from this vantage point the development would not have a domineering presence.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the side extension would not be harmful to the character or appearance of No 7 or Knyght Close. Accordingly there would be no conflict with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan of 2016 because the development would integrate well with and thus be respectful of its surroundings.

Other Matters

10. The rear elevations and gardens of various properties in Wills Way back onto the side elevation of No 7. While the side extension would be visible to the

occupiers of the houses in Wills Way, I find that the degree of physical separation would be such that this addition would not have an overbearing presence when viewed by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. I am also of the view that the scale and orientation of the side extension relative to the houses in Wills Way would be such that there would be no unacceptable overshadowing of those properties. I am therefore content that there would be no harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the houses in Wills Way.

Conditions

11. Apart from the standard time limit condition, I find it necessary that the development should be built to accord with the submitted plans for certainty and be constructed with external materials matching those of No 7, in the interests of the appearance of the area. I have therefore imposed conditions that address those matters.
12. To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties in Wills Way it is necessary that the permitted developments rights, allowing additional windows to be installed in the eastern elevation (including its roof) of the two storey side extension, are removed. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.
13. The Council's fifth suggested condition would require that on-site parking be available prior to the occupation of the extensions. However, I consider that the imposition of such a condition is unnecessary because No 7 already has off-street parking available to it, which would be unaffected by the development.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR