



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2022

by John Felgate BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 18TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/22/3298001

1 Rewlands Drive, Harestock, Winchester, Hampshire SO22 6PA

- 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 Dr M & Mrs K Mishra and Mr P Misra against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02782/HOU, dated 28 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side extension at 1 Rewlands Drive, Harestock, Winchester, Hampshire SO22 6PA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02782/HOU, dated 28 October 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced 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 shall match those used on the existing building.
 - 3) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing C	Proposed Elevations
Drawing D	Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Drawing E	Location and Site Plans

Reasons

2. I saw on my visit that Rewlands Drive is a late 20th century cul-de-sac of detached 2-storey houses. No 1, the appeal property, is typical of the style of development seen throughout the street. The property has previously been extended to the front and side, by enclosing the original open porch area, with part being incorporated into the study, and adding a first floor extension over the double garage. The present proposal seeks to add a further single-storey element to this side of the house, which would comprise a living room and bathroom, with the potential to be used as a bed-sitting room for an occupant with reduced mobility.
3. The proposed extension would continue the lines of the existing building. The front wall would line up with the previous extensions, and the rear with the building's original rear facade. The fascia would line through with that above

the existing porch and extended study. The ridge would sit just below the line of the main building's eaves. The roof pitch would match that of the main building. The fenestration would conform with the existing building in shape, style, size and spacing. The materials to be used on all these elements can be conditioned to match the existing building. In all these respects, it seems to me that the extension now proposed would clearly be a restrained and well-mannered addition, respecting the design and layout of both the dwelling itself and the surrounding estate.

4. I note the Council's view that the scheme would create an impression of terracing. However, the new extension would be single-storey and would stop short of the boundary with No 2 Rewlands Drive. Although No 2 also has a single storey side extension of its own, the space that would remain between Nos 1 and 2, at both ground and first floor levels, would be more than adequate to avoid any terracing effect. In any event, the spacing would still be considerably more generous than many others on the same estate, and especially Nos 4-9 and 11/12. In the context of these other examples, a closer relationship than now exists between the appeal property and No 2 would not cause any significant visual harm.
5. I also note the Council's concern that the proposed development would block the view currently obtainable between Nos 1 and 2 Rewlands Drive. But this view, towards the rear gardens of the properties behind, is narrow and limited in extent, and contains little of any interest. As such, it seems to me that the view through this gap is incidental rather than designed. I can therefore see no basis for suggesting that this is a feature of any importance. It follows that the loss of such views would not cause any material harm.
6. The development would have the effect of elongating a building that is already quite wide. But that in itself does not make it unacceptable. The site has sufficient width to accommodate the development comfortably, and for the reasons already explained, I consider the design to be acceptable. I note the Council's suggestion that the development would not appear subservient, because of the lack of a set-back. But the extension would be far smaller than either the existing or the original building; as such, I am satisfied that it would be subservient.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would have no adverse effects on the area's character or appearance. As such it would accord with the relevant provisions of Policies WT1 and CP13 of the Local Plan Part 1¹, and Policy DM16 of the Local Plan Part 2², which together require developments to achieve high standards of design and respect their local context, setting and surroundings.

Other matters

8. I note the concerns of the adjoining occupiers regarding the effects on light at No 2 Rewlands Drive, having regard to the difference in levels, and the existing window in No 2's side extension. But nevertheless, the development now proposed is only single storey, and its pitched roof would not be excessively tall. Moreover, the relationship between these two properties would not be in any way an unusual one.

¹ Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy, adopted March 2013

² Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations, adopted April 2017

9. Any issues relating to smoke emissions from the proposed chimney would be controllable under other legislation. As such, this is not a planning consideration, and is not a matter that can be taken into account in the present appeal..
10. As far as I can tell from the submitted plans, there is no proposal to include a kitchen. I therefore see no reason to regard the new extension as an annex. In any event, any independent use from the main dwelling would amount to a material change of use, which would require planning permission in its own right.

Conclusion and conditions

11. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposed development would respect the area's character and appearance, and would thus accord with the relevant policies of the development plan. No material considerations have been substantiated that would justify refusal. The appeal is therefore allowed.
12. In granting permission, I have imposed conditions to control the choice of materials and requiring adherence to the approved plans. These are necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance, and to ensure certainty as to the nature of the development permitted.

J Felgate

INSPECTOR