
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Mrs J Wilson BA BTP MRTPI DMS

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

Decision date: 17th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/17/3175959

32 Clydesdale Way, Totton SO40 8HZ

- 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 Andy and Mrs Linsey Hayter against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/10154, dated 1 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent property (No 33 Clydesdale Road) with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is located within an established residential development where properties display a variety of size though the architectural style and palette of materials are generally consistent. The property is a semi-detached house also attached to the neighbouring property No 33 Clydesdale Road (No 33) (the next semi-detached house) by linked garages.
4. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, the scale and bulk of the proposal would lack subservience and erode the space between this and the neighbouring property adversely affecting the appearance and causing visual imbalance with its semi-detached pair. This would be at odds with and out of keeping with the prevailing character of the residential estate.
5. For these reasons the proposal would harm the appearance of the host building and result in a material impact on the street scene, both front and back, detracting from character of the property and the surrounding area.

Living conditions

6. The proposed extension would, due to its height, rearward projection and proximity to the neighbouring property result in a harmful effect on outlook

from No 33 causing an overbearing impact on its occupants and harming their living conditions.

Other matters

7. Several other extensions in the vicinity have been cited by the appellant drawing comparisons in support of their appeal. One example involves two extensions above adjoining garages in the cul-de-sac to the rear of the appeal property. Whilst it is unclear whether these were constructed at the same time they serve to illustrate how such extensions change the nature of the relationship of the properties to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Two other examples involve extensions above just one of a pair of garages, as is proposed in this appeal. In both examples the second garage is separated from its host property and the relationship with surrounding buildings differs from the appeal proposal and incorporate a significant set back from the front elevation of the building. Neither of these examples appeared to incorporate a two storey flat roofed element and thus are not directly comparable to the appeal before me.
8. I note the reasons why the appellants want a larger house to meet the demands of a growing family. However little weight can be attached to the personal circumstances of the occupants which will change over time whereas the development would be permanent.
9. I have also taken into account the appellant's willingness to amend the materials to tile hanging to seek to make the extension subservient however I do not consider that this change would overcome the harm which I have identified above.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the proposal would cause material harm to the appearance of the host dwelling, to the character and appearance of the area and be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property. This would be in conflict with the objectives of Policy CS2 of the New Forest District Council Core Strategy (2009) which seeks to ensure that new development is well designed, contributes positively to local distinctiveness, is sympathetic in its relationship with adjoining buildings and does not cause unacceptable effects on local character and amenities and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR