



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2023

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/23/3317927

3 Long Barrow Close, South Wonston, Hampshire SO21 3ED

- 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 Mrs Helene Taylor against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02205/HOU, dated 3 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey side extension to existing single dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Helene Taylor against Winchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Long Barrow Close is a curved multi-ended cul-de-sac accessed from Waverley Drive and is within a large suburban residential estate. Properties in general are two-storey detached dwellings with linked or detached garages. However, the main characteristic of this area is how dwellings are grouped. They are either grouped around the cul-de sac ends facing each other, or face onto the road. This layout creates a compressed townscape with limited sight lines and where longer vistas occur, they provide direction within the road layout.
5. The host dwelling is orientated to face the adjacent property, 2 Long Barrow Close, and the shared garage building, rather than the road. Its side elevation broadly aligns with the frontage of No 2 and is set back behind an open garden area. The rear garden of the host dwelling is enclosed by a solid fence within the curve of Long Barrow Close. This means the property is reasonably prominent in the street scene and the space around it provides some visual relief to the Close's layout aiding legibility.
6. The proposal would extend the side elevation of the appeal dwelling to the road edge, subsuming the existing open garden area. It would extend beyond the existing building line created by the front of No 2 and the garages and would

enclose the otherwise open frontage. The length of the proposed rear elevation and proximity to the road edge would curtail one of the few vistas out of the Close towards Waverley Drive. It would, therefore, condense the visual openness which denotes the entrance into Long Barrow Close and constrain views out of it. This along with the dominant location of the host dwelling within the street scene would be overwhelming and further enclose the already compressed character of its surroundings.

7. It is appreciated that along Long Barrow Close and the surrounding roads there is a mix of frontage depths and treatments. However, this simply serves to enforce that within this area the effect on character and appearance should be determined regarding the specific circumstances and context of each case. My attention has also been drawn to an extension at 1 Long Barrow Close. This constitutes a first-floor extension over an existing ground floor section of the house. The proximity to the road edge had, therefore, already been established prior to the application and so it is not directly comparable to the scheme before me.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, conflict with Policies MTRA3 and CP13 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy, and DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations, as far as they seek new development to be of high-quality design which responds positively to its context.

Other Matters

9. It is noted interested parties have raised concerns relating to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants and drainage. Nevertheless, as I am dismissing the appeal, I have not pursued these matters further.
10. The appellant contends that they were not given an opportunity to discuss potential solutions to the harm identified with the Council. However, no information relating to potential scheme alterations has been submitted, and not all schemes may be capable of being rendered acceptable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, which would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR