



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/25/3365523

2 Bassett Dale, Southampton, SO16 7GT

- 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 Viejaz against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Reference is 24/01482/FUL.
 - The development proposed the erection of a detached summerhouse and raised decking area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a detached summerhouse and raised decking area at 2 Bassett Dale, Southampton, SO16 7GT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01482/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100 & 101.
 2. The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 2 Bassett Dale, Southampton.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has been largely completed; this does not alter my approach to assessing the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is detached dwelling towards the outer edge of a highway bend with a generous rear garden with open land beyond and a stream crossing the site partway down. It lies within an attractive suburban area where well-proportioned homes and large plots prevail. The proposal is as described above, with the sizeable summerhouse planned to have a flat roof some 3 metres above relevant ground level.

Living conditions

5. The Council is concerned that the scheme would be unneighbourly. It considers this would be because of its height, external appearance and proximity to the boundary giving rise to an unduly dominant, overbearing and visually intrusive structure when viewed from the nearest neighbouring property.
-

6. The garden of the pertinent neighbouring dwelling (46 Saxholm Dale) is extensive and lies broadly to the south of the planned structure; there is thus not an issue of loss of light or any material impact upon sunlight. The ground levels are such that the summerhouse would be positioned on land well below the dwellings and most of the area of within the generous gardens and to my mind the scheme could therefore not be said to be over-sized or prominent. The summerhouse would be a considerable distance from the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling which would face the structure obliquely and be largely screened by existing vegetation.
7. Some upper walling and roof would be visible from a section of the neighbouring garden, but this would be very much a secondary line of view rather than any intrusive feature within the main attractive and generous vista. The planned external elevational finish is unusual but to my mind would be visually low key, regress into the landscape, and could be seen as a modern interpretation of traditional dark painted corrugated iron. Even allowing for proximity to the side boundary, vegetation between the two gardens would continue to prevail. The scheme would not unduly intrude upon neighbouring privacy. In my opinion the appeal proposal would be relatively innocuous in its immediate and wider context.
8. In all of the circumstances, I would therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not be reasonably classed as unneighbourly.
9. Policy SDP1 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (as amended 2015) is relevant. Amongst other matters, this calls for development to protect residential amenity. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not conflict with this policy. It would also not run contrary to the relevant objectives of the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2006).

Conditions

10. I agree with the Council that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed approved plans to provide certainty. As also suggested, there should be a condition to restrict future use in the interests of amenity. My wording on this is a simplified version of that proposed by the Council.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR