



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 June 2021

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/21/3272058

15 Roman Road, Basingstoke, RG23 8EP

- 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 D Newlands against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03109/HSE, dated 6 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 17 Roman Road, with particular regard to any overbearing effect and overshadowing.

Reasons

3. The extension would project from the side and rear elevations of the appeal property. It would extend along the boundary shared with 17 Roman Road (No. 17) and would rise to a full two storey height, partly constructed over an existing single storey rear extension. While a relatively open aspect would remain to the garden associated with No.17 with views retained down the length of the garden, the extension would tower over the area of patio located near to the rear elevation and would be particularly imposing when using this outdoor space closest to the dwelling. That No. 17 has previously been extended or the presence of an existing garage building would not preclude this effect. The proposal would therefore have the result of significantly enclosing this area and would result in an overbearing effect, giving rise to a substantial reduction in the enjoyment of this outdoor space associated with No. 17.
4. Furthermore, due to the orientation of the appeal property and its neighbouring dwelling, the proposed two-storey rear extension would further reduce the amount of sunlight that reaches the rear amenity area of No. 17, markedly and unacceptably increasing the degree of overshadowing of this area. The presence of an intervening access way would do little to ameliorate this given the height of the proposed extension.
5. I therefore find that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 17, by way of an overbearing impact

and overshadowing effect. Thus, the proposal conflicts with policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (adopted May 2014), insofar as it seeks to ensure development provides a high quality of amenity for neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

6. I note that no objection is raised in respect of the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. I have no reason to find differently. However, the lack of harm in this respect, together with the benefits that would result, including an improved standard of accommodation to the occupiers of the property, are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR