



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/21/3280916

21 Upton Crescent, Nursling, SO16 8AA

- 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 Purvis against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01606/FULLS, dated 25 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2021.
 - The development is proposed front, rear and side extensions and raising of roof for 1st floor accommodation (resubmission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed front, rear and side extensions and raising of roof for 1st floor accommodation (resubmission) at 21 Upton Crescent, Nursling, SO16 8AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01606/FULLS dated 25 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall, where stated, match those on the existing building and otherwise be in accordance with those shown on the approved plans.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 598/07/101; 598/07/102; 598.1/02/100; 598.1/02/103; 598.1/02/104; and, 598.1/02/105.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development as it appears on the submitted application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the western side of Upton Crescent. The host property comprises a detached bungalow with various flat roofed single storey

- extensions. A driveway at the front of the appeal site leads to a parking area and front garden. To the rear is a large garden.
5. Upton Crescent is essentially a large cul-de-sac comprising a mixture of detached bungalows, chalet bungalows and some two storey dwellings, which vary in terms of their age, style, scale, orientation, materials and layout. A number of properties in the road have been extended at roof and ridge level or remodelled, and there are also examples of modern infill.
 6. Policy COM2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) (TVLP) states that development within the defined settlement boundaries will be permitted provided it is appropriate to other local plan policies. An extract from the proposals map provided by the Council shows that the appeal site is located within the defined settlement boundary.
 7. Policy E1 of the TVLP states that new development will be permitted if it is of a high quality of design and local distinctiveness. To achieve this, various criteria require, amongst other matters, new development to integrate, respect and complement the character of the area in terms of its layout, appearance, scale and materials. Also, to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the character of the surrounding area. Paragraph 7.12 continues by stating that extensions can overwhelm existing buildings and cumulatively impact on the character of an area, and to avoid this, proposals should be subsidiary to the original building.
 8. Whilst I accept that the proposed extensions to the front, side and rear of the host property would increase its footprint, the generous size of the existing plot is more than sufficient to accommodate the resulting larger footprint. In addition, the proposed footprint would not be dissimilar to that existing on the properties to the south and north of the appeal site, 19 Upton Crescent (No.19) and 23 Upton Crescent (No.23) respectively. Moreover, the host property's existing single storey garage on the boundary with No.19 is shown to be retained, as is the hosts single storey flat roofed extension to the boundary with No.23, in both cases maintaining a reasonable gap between the host, as proposed to be extended upwards and its neighbours.
 9. No.19 is a large modern chalet bungalow with accommodation at first floor level contained within an expansive slate roof comprising dormers on the front elevation and a large gabled extension at the rear. No.23 also appears to have accommodation in the roof. In addition, as a result of its wider built frontage, No.23 has a larger expanse of roof than the host property, and its ridge is also much higher than the host due, in part, to the slope in the road.
 10. Within the above context, the proposed raising of the roof of the host property, whose ridge already sits below that of No.23, would not appear out of scale or harmful to this part of the streetscene. I accept that there would be a material change to the appearance of the host property when viewed from the road. Even so, given the modest scale of the existing bungalow, compared to its immediate neighbours, the proposed increase in bulk and scale combined with the modern design would not introduce a dominant or incongruous feature.
 11. As I observed on site, within the surrounding area there are numerous examples of properties that have been extended at roof level or remodelled to provide habitable accommodation at first floor level, resulting in a variety of roof forms, ridge heights, building layouts and forms. In some cases, these

extended properties are located next to more traditional bungalows, but those relationships do not detract from the character and appearance of the area and instead add some interest to the streetscene.

12. Although paragraph 7.12 of the TVLP states that extensions should be subsidiary to the host property, this guidance is not repeated within policy E1, but notwithstanding this, it should be applied with flexibility and not rigidly. Moreover, in applying this paragraph any assessment should also have regard to the individual circumstances of the case and its local context, as well as the need to make efficient use of land, which is the approach I have adopted in determining this appeal.
13. Based on the above, I am satisfied that the proposed extensions would, on balance, sit reasonably comfortably on the appeal site and that the host property, as extended, even with its remodelled design, would not appear out of character with its surroundings. The proposed extensions would not materially upset the existing built rhythm of the streetscene and would be an improvement on existing. Even though the new extensions would exceed the height of the main ridge to the host, this would not appear out of keeping given the varied character of Upton Crescent. Moreover, the proposed extensions would not be overly discordant or dominant features given the local context.
14. Accordingly, whilst there would be some conflict with paragraph 7.12 of the TVLP, the harm that results would be limited and would not be sufficient in itself to justify the refusal of planning permission. I find, therefore, that the appeal proposal would not conflict with policy COM2 and policy E1 of the TVLP, and neither would it conflict with the corresponding policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (Framework).

Other Matters

15. Concerns have been raised by interested parties in relation to the overlooking of neighbouring properties. However, this is not an issue that has been raised by the Council in objecting to the appeal proposal. Moreover, I am satisfied, based on the proposed design, specifically the covered balcony on the rear elevation and my observations on site, that this is not a matter that would give rise to any material harm.

Conditions

16. The Council has suggested conditions in their Questionnaire which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. Conditions requiring compliance with the submitted plans and for materials to match existing and those shown on the approved plans are necessary and reasonable in order to secure a high-quality development and to reflect the details included within the application. I have, however, added a list of approved plans for clarity.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR