

**Appeal reasoning**  
**2020/5951/P**

Appeal of a single-story wrap around extension with a light well.

**Site Description**

The building is placed at the cul-de-sac end of Hillfield Road facing north. The houses on the north side are perched up the hill with a steep staircase leading to the houses. The Victorian terrace house has two floors to the front and third floor built into the roof space. To the rear, the outer rigger of the houses have three floors with raised gardens with a continues incline to the north.

**Proposal**

The proposal is to cut into the raised garden with a 4m full width extension and utilise the side passage leaving a large light well that will give light to the bedrooms in the new configuration. The proposal will bring the kitchen and living room to the rear to accommodate modern living with easy access to the garden.

**Amenity**

I would like to raise the positive conclusion of the case officer that the extension will not have an amenity issues on the neighbours as the extension will basically sit below the garden fence line.

In terms of outlook the case officer says the following in paragraph 3.3

“In terms of immediate outlook with the neighbouring properties the proposals should not have significant effects. As stated above, the proposed extension would sit below the boundary fence with no. 7 Hillfield Road and consequently it would not have any significant impact on the outlook form the garden or ground floor windows at this site. The upper floor windows would also maintain an outlook to the rear and above the extensions. There would be no undue obscuring or loss of aspect from any windows or unacceptable sense of enclosure. “

I would also like to point out that the building opposite South Mansion will not be affected as the gardens on Hillfield Road are 100ft long with trees at the end of some of the gardens resulting that the extension not be that visible from the mansion.

**Design and Character**

The case officer main consideration as stated in paragraph 2.1 “Design and Character” and “Impact on amenity”. The case officer did not find any amenity issue but refused the application on “Design and Character”. The case officer conclusion paragraph 4 states the following.

“The design of the proposed extension would fail to take account of the local context and given its design, bulk, visibility and location, would result in an incongruous addition to the local townscape. The proposal would have a cumulative impact that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area”

As the case officer stated in amenity section that the extension will not be visible so it seems odd some of the refusal reasons he has stated above such as "local context", "visibility and location", "incongruous addition to the local townscape" and "the host building and the surrounding area" when no one can really see the extension. Please note that the building is not listed or in a conservation area, so the conclusion seems inconsistent with the case officer previous statement.

If one dives deeper in the design and character section of the case officer report section 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. These paragraphs refer to the extension needing to be subordinate to the original host building. Well as the host building is 3 floors at the rear and the extension is only at the ground floor level and cuts into the hill one would surely deem it to be subordinate. Especially in the context of a 100ft gardens.

As the case officer pointed out other houses in the road have extensions and infill extensions and he states that these extension are modest in size "Several properties along Hillfield Road benefit from side infill and rear extensions however the existing extensions are modest in overall size, are generally subordinate to the host dwelling and appropriate in their context."

The wrap around extensions to the north side of Hillfield Road up to Gondar Gardens are;

- 47 Hillfield Road -2m wrap around extension - 2018/1408/P
- 43 Hillfield Road -2m wrap around extension - 2017/7030/P
- 49 Hillfield Road -2m wrap around extension - 2007/5702/P

These extensions are still 2m wrap around extension and these houses do not have the same topography as number 5 Hillfield Road as the gardens of these house are on one level so one may conclude that these extensions would be more prominent.

If one examines the planning history on Gondar Garden the story are slightly different.

Gondar garden

- 54 Gondar Gardens – 3m\* wrap around extension - 2017/6362/P
- 41 Gondar Gardens – 3m wrap around extension - 2017/4580/P
- 24 Gondar Gardens – 3m wrap around extension - 2015/4059/P
- 55 Gondar Gardens – 3m wrap around extension - 2015/1570/P
- 20 Gondar Gardens – 4m wrap around extension - 2015/1484/P
- 29 Gondar Gardens – 3m wrap around extension - 2014/7236/P

\*All extensions are measured from the end of the outer rigger of the original house and do not include the infill extension.

These house benefit from three story to the front, but the outer rigger of these houses are only 2 floors high. So, one would argue that these extension are not so subservient to the host building. These extensions do not cut into the topography of the garden and yet all got planning for 3m wrap around extension for the exception of No. 20 Gondar Garden that got planning for 4m extension.

If we look at the planning history of the next street at Achilles Road which has similar houses characteristics of Hillfield Road with two floors at the front and three-story outer rigger but with much smaller garden we still see many application that have been granted for wrap around extensions.

#### Achilles Road

- 35 Achilles Road – 4.15m wrap around extension - 2020/4566/P
- 39 Achilles Road – 4.15m wrap around extension - 2020/0300/P
- 52 Achilles Road – 2m wrap around extension - 2018/0398/P
- 14 Achilles Road – 2.2m wrap around extension - 2017/4936/P
- 26 Achilles Road – 2.7m wrap around extension - 2017/4203/P
- 20 Achilles Road – 2.2m wrap around extension (8.3m deep) - 2017/3271/P
- 6 Achilles Road – 2.2m wrap around extension - 2016/3193/P
- 37 Achilles Road – 4.15wrap around extension - 2015/3612/P
- 33 Achilles Road – 2.5m wrap around extension - 2013/7398/P

Please note that 35, 37 and 39 Achilles Road extensions are all next to each other and all are more than 4m deep extensions. The gardens are significantly smaller. These extensions are clearly visible from neighbouring properties and gardens, yet the council deemed them acceptable and granted planning permission. 35 and 39 Achilles planning was granted recently.

Paragraph 2.4 of the case officer reports in essence states as 3 Hillfield Road got a 6m extension which was granted under appeal (see case officer report section neighbouring site). It is inconceivable to state that as one neighbour won his appeal the adjoining neighbour should pay the price. So, the case officer now moves the goal post stating that an extension should be subordinate to the original host building and subordinate to the neighbours extensions. This is surely cannot be the case. None the less it is clear from Achilles Road that a cluster of houses with a 4m wrap extensions is acceptable.

Paragraph 2.5 compares this planning application to the application that were refused on 3 Hillfield Road to infill side extension of the 6m extension stating that these applications were in similar scale “which is of a similar scale to extensions that were refused planning permission (2019/4621/P and 2019/4710/P) at no. 3 Hillfield Road”. Well going from 4m to 6m that is 50% increase, and it is clearly not similar. If the case officer truly believes that 2m makes no material difference then the planning officer should have approved the planning application as 43, 47 and 49 Hillfield Road where approved and they are just 2m smaller.

The application on 3 Hillfield Road refusal are on completely different grounds as the council refused the 6m extension the council didn't want to approve any additions on top of what they already refused. Diving into planning in and out of another planning application of 3 Hillfield Road will distract from this application and could be toxic. This application should be addressed on its own merits.

The paragraph continues with “The infilling of the outrigger would also fail to preserve the local character and pattern of development, detracting from the uniformity of the properties.” The list of planning application of wrap around extension clearly demonstrates that infill extension is not consider a planning issue. Furthermore, if one looks at infill extension the list of planning approval are extensive.

**Summary**

The extension in the context of the site topography will not be noticeable and visible to the surrounding area. No loss of outlook or amenity to the surrounding area as stated by the case officer. The extension will be subordinate to the host building and will not be higher than the garden fences and will not have any impact on the character of the area.