



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2021

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/21/3275433

1 Welles Road, Chandler's Ford, SO53 2GQ

- 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 Andrew Webb against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/20/89088, dated 25 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is addition of rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 16 Springfield Road, with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

3. The proposal would see the appeal property extended alongside its side boundary. The neighbouring property, No. 16 Springfield Road, faces out at the back towards this boundary with a small intervening area of garden.
4. The floor level of the existing property is significantly higher than the garden at the rear, and the garden continues to fall away to the southwest. This topography is not accurately represented on the submitted plans, which suggest that the garden is level at the rear of the appeal property.
5. Although a lower floor level is proposed for the extension, its eaves height would match the eaves height of the existing bungalow. The scale of the extension would appear to increase as it extends out to the rear, owing to the sloping garden. The diminishing height of the boundary fence would mean that the proposed extension would be highly visible to the occupiers of No. 16 and would appear overbearing. Its harmful impact would be felt from the rear rooms of the dwelling and from within its rear garden.
6. The proposed extension would be in direct view from the rear of No. 16 and, owing to its proximity, would be a dominant feature. Its solid form would have a much greater impact on the outlook from this dwelling than the verdant appearance of trees and shrubs within the neighbour's garden. Furthermore, it would be sited alongside the southeast facing boundary and would therefore have an adverse impact on levels of light reaching the garden and the dwelling. I have doubts over the accuracy of the submitted sun path / shadow analysis,

particularly as the other plans submitted do not accurately represent the site levels. However, even if I do take it into account it demonstrates a significant impact on morning light reaching the rear façade of No. 16 and its garden during the winter months, and some impact on the garden through the summer.

7. The proposed terrace would be lower than the existing raised area, however it would create an opportunity for occupiers of the appeal property to easily look towards No. 16 and its rear garden from a position elevated above the existing garden level. It would be enclosed by a balustrade and would thus be more useful to the occupiers of the appeal property than the existing raised area at the back of the dwelling, which is unenclosed and therefore not safe to use.
8. In summary, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 16 Springfield Road. It would be contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and Emerging Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, which together seek to ensure that development proposals take proper account of context, are appropriately designed in relation to neighbouring buildings, and do not have an unacceptable impact on existing residents.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR