

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

**by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/16/3162893**

**1 Eastmeare Court, Totton, Southampton SO40 8WT**

- 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 & Mrs Williams against the decision of New Forest District Council.
  - The application, Ref. 16/11102, dated 4 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2016.
  - The development proposed is a proposed additional first floor bedroom and bathroom above the existing garage and utility room. Proposed cropped hip ridge line to be kept 900mm lower than the existing ridge line.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. There are three different dates for the application in the information on the planning portal. I have used the date on the appeal form, which is the same as on the Council's Notice of Refusal.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area, in particular the Eastmeare Court and Briarwood Road street scenes.

## Reasons

4. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is positioned on a corner plot at the junction of Eastmeare Court and Briarwood Road. Because of this siting and the fairly modest size of the front curtilage, the single storey projection is a prominent feature in views from both roads.
  5. Leaving this prominence temporarily aside, the Eastmeare Court development includes several examples of the same house type, with the single storey projection originally comprising two garages as is the case at No. 1. Bearing in mind that the dwellings are good sized four bedroom family houses forming a medium density development, I consider that the overall scale of the projections, with their clearly subordinate single storey height, results in a balanced composition with a relatively spacious layout that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
-

6. However, although the ridge of the proposed extension would be set down from the main ridge by 900mm, to my mind it would still be of a scale that would upset the balance of the building, appearing both uncomfortably large in itself and having the effect of the dwelling as a whole being perceived as bulky and excessive for its plot size.
7. Furthermore, the corner location of No. 1 would exacerbate the harmful effect, with the extension's aforementioned prominence comprising a jarring feature to anyone travelling along Briarwood Road or leaving Eastmeare Court. It would draw the eye as being overly large for its context.
8. I have taken account of the grounds of appeal and have noted that the scheme has evolved in an attempt to overcome the Council's objections. However, this does not alter my view that this amended scheme now before me is unacceptable. Mention is made of the screening effect of the hedge, but this cannot be relied on in perpetuity. Other examples of extensions nearby are cited, but I consider the context of these is different and in one of the examples the outcome is not one that I regard as contributing positively to the area, due to the large size of the addition.
9. Overall, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would be in conflict with Policy CS2 of the New Forest District (outside the National Park) Core Strategy 2008 and Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
10. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR