

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2019

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/19/3231698

54 Bartram Road, Totton, Southampton, SO40 9JG

- 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 and Mrs Webb against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/10357, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension and internal alterations to form additional accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey rear extension and internal alterations to form additional accommodation at 54 Bartram Road, Totton, Southampton, SO40 9JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/10357, dated 19 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. 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.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 54 B. Rd. 01/01; 01/02; & 01/03.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling in a street of similar detached and semi-detached homes which lie on generally narrow and long plots. The front building line is regular whilst the rear line is very varied with the form of original structures and miscellaneous, often two storey, extensions. The appeal proposal is as described above. It would effectively replace a smaller single and two storey existing structure and provide increased living and bedroom space.
-

Living conditions

4. The Council and neighbours to the north west (No 52) are concerned that given height and proximity to the shared side boundary the proposed two storey rear extension would result in unacceptable loss of light and would present an overbearing outlook to the windows of the neighbouring property. This home has on its facing side a ground floor main door and kitchen window and an upstairs bathroom and bedroom window. Like many other properties in the row No 52 has a two storey rear extension and some of the accommodation of relevance is within this, the bedroom window sits on its flank.
5. The appeal property is one of, if not the, most modestly rearward developed dwellings on this stretch and I can see that the Appellants would wish to increase accommodation here and still continue to benefit from a long garden. To my mind the extension could be classed as quite a thoughtful one. It would not extend as wide as the existing home towards the boundary, would embody a hipped roof, would have a ridge height lower than the main property and would not present any windows which would lead to loss of privacy. The appeal property as a whole is of a height which is a little less than No 52. The orientation of the new works would be to the south east of the neighbour which would mean for much of the day there would be no question of loss of sunlight and the impacts earlier in the day would be minimal given orientation and existing built form. Outlook is presently restricted from the ground floor kitchen and front door area by boundary screening and buildings beyond, the bathroom is not a habitable room, and the bedroom has and would continue to have oblique and skyward views albeit a little less extensive.
6. Having regard to these points in my opinion the scheme would not unduly impact upon the light ingress to the neighbouring home or outlook from its windows and doorway. The nature of the locality is one of fairly tight relationships between buildings and the situation after the planned development would not be out of the ordinary or one of unreasonable hemming-in of neighbouring occupiers.
7. The Council's Core Strategy includes Policy CS2 which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development would not unduly impact upon residential amenity. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with this key element of the development plan policy.

Conditions

8. The Council reasonably suggests the standard commencement condition along with a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is also appropriate in the interests of visual amenity.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR