The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2011

by Martin Brookes BA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 July 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/11/2154787
1 Valerian Close, Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 7PL

- 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 & Mrs D & S Russell against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/11/68569, dated 2 February 2011, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2011.
- The development proposed is a first floor side extension and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and single storey rear extension at 1 Valerian Close, Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/11/68569, dated 2 February 2011, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing No. 01.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is within an area of modern housing comprising terraced houses and closely spaced semi-detached and detached properties of a variety of complementary designs. The area appears to have been developed on open-plan principles but some boundary walls and hedges immediately adjacent to the footway provide a degree of enclosure in some places.

4. Variety in the street scene is also provided by the curved alignment of the roads and the variable distances of buildings from the roads, with some

positioned very close to the footway in prominent locations. The appeal property is one such building, as are the dwellings at 1 Rosebay Close, 10 Meadowsweet Way and 11 Meadowsweet Way.

5. Overall, the area is characterised by a fairly intensive form of development with street scenes that display a mixture of openness and enclosure.

6. The single storey rear extension would be within the existing enclosed rear garden and would have no material effect on the character or appearance of the area.

7. The first floor extension would be constructed wholly over an existing single storey extension and would therefore project no closer to Meadowsweet Way. However, it would increase the height and bulk of the building close to the road. This would also increase the enclosure of the road at a point where the gap between the house and 11 Meadowsweet Way is relatively narrow. This greater degree of enclosure would not be harmful, but would serve to reinforce the existing variety that characterises the street scene.

8. A two-storey structure close to the road would be a distinctive but not uncharacteristic feature of the area. The extended building would be prominent in views along Meadowsweet Way from the north, but would present a reasonably attractive front elevation. This would be a more effective and interesting termination of the view than is currently provided by the visually weak existing single storey extension and featureless side gable wall of 20 Meadowsweet Way beyond. The view would also be comparable to the view of 1 Rosebay Close from the north.

9. From the south, the extended building would be much less prominent than the side gable wall of 11 Meadowsweet Way.

10. My conclusion on the main issue is that the extensions would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area and would not conflict with saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011).

Other Matters

11. I have considered all other matters that have been raised. In particular I have considered the effect of the extensions on living conditions at 9 and 11 Meadowsweet Way in terms of outlook and daylight. However, I share the Council's view that the extension would be too far away to have any material effect, particularly bearing in mind the extent of built development currently at the appeal property. I also share the Council's view that appropriate provision would remain for car parking.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Martin Brookes

INSPECTOR