

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2016

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/16/3154516

Perrott Ville, 24 Ramley Road, Pennington, Hampshire, SO41 8GQ

- 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 Dr John Hare against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/10269, dated 25 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension; single-storey rear extension and replacement pitched roof to existing flat garage roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, I note that both the Council's decision notice and the appeal form describe the development as a "two-storey rear extension; single storey side extension; porch and roof alterations". I consider this description to be more accurate and consequently, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and on the streetscene; and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 1 Hazel Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling, which is situated in a primarily residential area. House types in the vicinity of the appeal site vary in terms of their age, size and appearance. Notwithstanding this variety, the appeal dwelling has a distinctive character in terms of its style and proportions.
 5. The proposal is to construct a two-storey rear extension, plus a single-storey side extension. In addition, a new porch and roof alterations are proposed.
-

The submitted plans also show that the existing garage at the side of the dwelling would be converted and altered to provide additional accommodation.

6. Policy CS2 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy 2009 (CS) requires (amongst other things) that new development is well designed; contributes positively to local distinctiveness; and is appropriate and sympathetic to its setting, in terms of its scale and appearance. I consider that Policy CS2 is consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires new development to be of high quality design; to be visually attractive; and to add to the overall quality of the area (paragraphs 17 and 58).
7. In my opinion, the proposed two-storey rear extension would appear as a dominant and disproportionate addition to the property, because of its depth and overall mass. Accordingly, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the rear extension would be clearly visible from Ramley Road across the front garden area of the neighbouring property at number 22. At present, the open aspect at the rear of the appeal dwelling contributes positively to the spacious appearance of this part of the streetscene. This would be unacceptably compromised, particularly by the first-floor element of proposed extension.
8. I consider that both the proposed single-storey extension (to provide a garage at the side of the dwelling) and the replacement porch at the front of the property would be acceptable, in terms of their appearance, scale and positioning. However, I find that the two-storey rear extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS2 of the CS and with the Framework, as referred to above.

Living Conditions

9. The proposal would involve the construction of a single-storey garage extension on the side of the property. This would be sited close to the side boundary and alongside a small rear patio area that serves number 1 Hazel Road (number 1). In addition, the side wall of the proposed two-storey rear extension would be positioned just over 3.5m from the same boundary.
10. The Council contends that the proposed rear extension would have an overbearing effect on the amenities of the occupiers of number 1. I also note that an objection from the occupiers of number 1 was submitted to the Council during its consideration of the planning application. Accordingly, the Council argues that the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS2 of the CS, because of its adverse impact on amenity. In addressing this issue, I have also taken into account, as a material consideration, paragraph 17 of the Framework, which states (amongst other things) that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
11. The appellant has submitted illustrative material which shows the overshadowing effect of the proposal on number 1. On the basis of this evidence, I am satisfied that any loss of natural light to number 1 would not be significant or unduly harmful. However, in terms of outlook, I consider that the proposed two-storey rear extension would have an unacceptably overbearing impact on the patio area of number 1, because of its height, length and

positioning relative to the shared boundary between the properties. I consider that this would be detrimental to the occupiers' enjoyment of their property, as it would make their patio area a less pleasant place in which to be. I therefore find that the proposal would conflict with Policy CS2 of the CS and with the Framework, as referred to above.

12. I acknowledge that the proposed single-storey garage extension would not have any adverse impacts but this does not alter my findings above.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has drawn my attention to an earlier planning permission for a two-storey rear extension in 2006. When considering that application, the Council stated that the extension would not "impact unreasonably on the amenities of adjacent properties". At that time, the site of number 1 was occupied by a single-storey bungalow. However, upon examination of the Council's records, it appears to me that the relationship between the earlier proposed extension and the bungalow on the adjoining land (now occupied by number 1) differed significantly when compared to the current appeal proposal. Accordingly, I do not accept that the earlier decision creates a precedent for this appeal.

14. Reference has also been made by the appellant to the Council's processing of the planning application. However, this is a matter that I am unable to consider and I have dealt with the appeal on its planning merits.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR