



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2017

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/17/3179687
93 Wavell Way, Winchester SO22 4EG

- 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 Tim King against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00233/HOU, dated 24 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "Erection of 2 storey side extension to replace single storey substandard room and wc. Ground floor lounge and disabled accessible shower room and utility. First floor additional bedroom for elderly disabled parent".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Wavell Way and the surrounding streets are of a residential character. There is some variation in the properties; however two storey semi-detached houses with central projecting front gables are a common house type as are short runs of terrace houses. There is a general uniformity to the houses and symmetry in the majority of the semi-detached and terrace properties. These are significant, locally distinctive, characteristics of the area.
4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, with a forward projecting gable adjacent to the party wall of its attached neighbour. The appeal scheme would introduce a side extension with its ridge height consistent with the existing ridge and a front projecting gable on a similar building line to the existing central gables on the pair of houses.
5. The extension would be a significant addition to the side of the property with no easily discernible transition between the original dwelling and the extension. This would result in a significant unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached properties appearing discordant with the general consistency in appearance and symmetry of the dwellings in the area. The use of matching materials and similar architectural detailing would not minimise this harm, nor would the end plot location of the property.
6. The Council's High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document - Adopted 2015 (the SPD) suggests that setting side extensions back from the

front elevation and keeping the height below that of the existing building is generally important. It also advises that extensions should convey an incremental transition of the building allowing the character of the original structure to be clearly discernible and that extensions should be generally subservient to the host dwelling. The extension would not accord with this advice.

7. There are a number of examples of extensions to existing buildings in the locality which do not accord with the recommendations of the SPD and are neither set below the ridge height or set back from the front of the property and so do not appear as subservient additions. Those at 27 Minden Way and 7 Fox Lane are substantially similar to the appeal scheme in that they extend to one side of a pair of semi-detached houses and, in the case of 7 Fox Lane, it also incorporates a front projecting gable feature. I observed a small number of other similar extensions to semi-detached properties in the area including on Wavell Way and Drayton Street. New houses, 33a and 35a Wavell Way, have been built on the end of short terraces extending to the side of the original buildings. These are less directly comparable to the appeal scheme, as it is not an extension to a semi-detached property, but nevertheless they share some attributes with it.
8. I do not have the full details of these schemes, or the circumstances that led to planning permission being granted for them. It appears that at least some were granted some time ago and before the adoption of the Council's SPD and the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations, adopted 2017 (the LP Part 2). These examples are not so prevalent that extensions of this nature are an overriding part of the character and appearance of the area. Further extensions that are not subservient to the host dwelling, and significantly unbalance a semi-detached pair of houses, would result in cumulative harm to the character and appearance of the area. These examples of other similar developments do not therefore persuade me that the appeal scheme is acceptable.
9. I am not convinced that a side extension which follows the advice in the SPD could not be constructed but still allow for the same floor levels to be maintained and incorporate windows of a suitable height rather than rooflights. Even if it were only possible to provide windows with a low lintel height it is unclear how this would compromise security as other windows in the house are set at a normal height.
10. The extension would make use of space to the side of the building, rather than at the rear where space is limited and it would replace a single storey structure which does not offer a high quality living space. I acknowledge that the extension will provide valuable additional accommodation for the appellant's elderly father who has limited mobility. However the design of the appeal scheme would not be the only means of extending to the side or to provide additional accommodation and so this does not lead me to conclude that the appeal scheme is acceptable.
11. Other forms of extensions, which could add significant volume to the dwelling, may well be able to be constructed under permitted development rights. These would not have the same effect in unbalancing the pair of semi-detached houses and so this factor also does not justify the appeal scheme. The extension would not overshadow any neighbouring properties. However this is a neutral factor and it does not weigh in favour of the development.

12. I therefore conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the design aims of Policies DM15 and DM16 of the LP Part 2 which require that development contributes to local distinctiveness and responds positively to the character and appearance of the local environment.

Conclusion

13. The adverse effects of the development are sufficient to mean that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. The benefits that would arise for the appellant through the additional living space would not outweigh this harm. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR