
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2018

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/17/3179219

Langstone, Lime Walk, Dibden Purlieu, SO45 4RA

- 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 David O'Reilly against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/10198, dated 9 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey extensions and a new roof to existing and proposed structures. Porch. Fenestration alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions to Langstone on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property Shalimar, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. Langstone is a detached dwelling which fronts onto Lime Walk. Although Langstone sits broadly in line with the properties to the south-west it sits completely forward of Shalimar, the neighbouring property to the north-east.
4. Langstone is a two storey dwelling and it sits in close proximity to the shared boundary with Shalimar. Its height and bulk is restricted by the first floor being partly contained in the roof space and there being a cat slide roof to the rear. Nevertheless, its close proximity to the shared boundary with Shalimar and its forward siting make it very prominent when viewed from the frontage of this neighbouring property.
5. The proposed extensions include raising the ridge height of Langstone and two, two storey rear extensions which would increase its overall depth. The two storey rear extension closest to Shalimar would be directly adjacent to the shared boundary. Although a hipped roof is proposed to replace the existing gable end roof, the proposal would, nevertheless, result in a significant increase in height and depth of built form along this shared boundary.
6. The frontage of Shalimar is mainly a driveway but it also has raised beds and planting and it is clear that the occupiers of this property spend time on its upkeep. The front of this property is also a place its occupants pass through

every time they go out or arrive back home. Langstone already has an imposing presence on the frontage of this property. To increase its built form to the extent proposed would make it significantly more dominant, resulting in it towering over the frontage to Shalimar and harmfully enclosing this area.

7. For these reasons the proposed extensions to Langstone would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of Shalimar in terms of a loss of outlook. As such it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy (2009) which requires new development to not cause unacceptable effects by reason of, amongst other things, visual intrusion.
8. I note the appellant's issues with the layout and design of their property and their comments about the impact the neighbouring property on the other side; Rogie, had on their property when extended. However, neither of these matters justifies the harm I have found to the living conditions of the occupiers of Shalimar. I also accept that there would be no material loss of light to Shalimar given the existing conditions. However, this does not override the harm I have found in terms of a loss of outlook. Finally, whilst I note the officer dealing with the application recommended approval local planning authorities are not bound to accept the recommendations of their officers.
9. I have had regard to all matters raised, including that the proposed extensions would make for a better looking property overall, but conclude that this does not outweigh the harm I have found. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR