



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2020

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/19/3242978

Hillside Lodge, 8 Bassett Green Drive, Southampton, Hampshire SO16 3QH

- 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 Nicholas Butt against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00808/FUL, dated 26 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear lean-to; erection of new first floor extension to form new master bedroom and ensuite; erection of new rear lean-to.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 6 Bassett Green Drive, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

3. Numbers 6 and 8 Bassett Green Drive are both bungalows. The properties are laid out in a tandem arrangement, one in front of the other, with No 8 nearest to Bassett Green Drive. The topography means that No 6 is slightly elevated above its neighbour. There are several windows in the south-east elevation of No 6 and these provide the occupiers of bedrooms with an outlook across the roof of the appeal property and beyond, towards the large crowns of mature trees located on the street frontage.
4. The proposed first floor extension would increase the height and bulk of the bungalow substantially, with the main part of the development being situated above an existing flat roof. Notwithstanding the difference in ground levels, there would be a significant loss of outlook for the occupiers of No 6 who would be faced with a blank gable wall at a distance of approximately 8 m. There is no right to a view per se, and No 6 is already shaded by nearby tree canopies. However, it is reasonable for the neighbours to expect to maintain a good standard of outlook from their habitable rooms. The proposed development would harm outlook to the extent that it would be oppressive.
5. The Council cites paragraph 2.2.7 of its Residential Design Guide (2006) (SPD) which recommends a minimum separation distance of 12.5 m between a window on a single storey house to a side wall of a 2 storey building. This is a

helpful rule of thumb, but it represents guidance only and therefore cannot be determinative. The SPD lends weight to the Council's case, but my conclusions are based mainly on my assessment at the site visit.

6. The appellant states that No 8's flat roof is due to be replaced by a pitched roof and that such an alteration would not require planning permission. I have seen no details of this proposal, and there is no firm evidence to show that this is a likely outcome in the event of me dismissing the appeal. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that a pitched roof would have the same impact as the appeal scheme by reason that permitted development rights limit extensions to the height of the highest part of the existing roof. This would result in a much lower roof ridge and a roof that, in all likelihood, would pitch away from No 6.
7. I have taken into account all other matters raised, including the lack of privacy in Bedrooms 2 and 3 of No 8 following the removal of a boundary hedge. However, there are no considerations which would justify the harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 6 arising from the appeal scheme.
8. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Saved Policy SDP1 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015) and Policy CS13 of the Southampton City Council Core Strategy (2010) insofar as these policies seek to ensure that development does not unacceptably affect the health, safety and amenity of the city and its citizens. These policies are consistent with Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR