
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/16/3157313

30 James Grieve Avenue, Locks Heath, Fareham SO31 6UD

- 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 Mrs Emma Ford against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/16/0774/FP, dated 5 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and single storey rear extensions at 30 James Grieve Avenue, Locks Heath, Fareham SO31 6UD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/16/0774/FP, dated 5 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Sheet 1 of 2 Proposed Two Storey Side and Single Storey Rear Extensions; and Sheet 2 of 2 Proposed Two Storey Side and Single Storey Rear Extensions.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The two storey side extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of the arrangements for off-street vehicle parking have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved parking arrangements shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the two storey side extension and shall be retained thereafter for the purposes of parking and manoeuvring vehicles.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal is accompanied by a 'Layout Plan', which postdates the Council's refusal of planning permission and shows the provision of an additional (third) off-street driveway/forecourt parking space. While I have had regard to the revised layout plan I have not treated it as being an application plan because it was unavailable to the Council when it made its decision.
-

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the streetscene; and whether the development would provide sufficient off-street parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The development would involve the construction of a primarily two storey side extension, which would subsume the property's existing garage, and a single storey rear extension. The Council takes no issue with the scale or appearance of the rear extension and I see no reason to a contrary view. My reasoning from herein therefore focuses on the side extension.
5. The appeal property (No 30) is a two storey detached house that occupies a corner position and is in a group of five detached houses (Nos 30 to 38) on the eastern side of James Grieve Avenue between its junction with Grenadier Close to the north and the cul-de-sac occupied by 16 to 28 James Grieve Avenue. While the side extension would infill much of the space between Nos 30 and 32, a gap of around one metre in width would be retained between the flank wall of the extension and No 32's side elevation, with the latter being hard up against these properties' shared boundary. Given the physical separation that there would be between the side extension and No 32 and the gaps between Nos 32 and 38, terracing in the normally accepted sense would not arise.
6. The Council considers because the front elevation of the two storey element of the extension would align with the No 30's main front elevation and this extension's ridge line would follow that of the host property that this addition would fail to have a subservient appearance. The Council therefore contends that there would be conflict with the Council's Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document of 2015 (the Design SPD).
7. I recognise that in many instances setting the front elevation of a side extension behind the host property's main front elevation and/or lowering the ridge line can assist in giving additions a subservient appearance. However, in this instance I consider that setting the front elevation back and/or lowering the ridge line would result in an extension with an unduly complicated appearance, which would be exposed to views within the streetscene, given the slight bend in the road and the staggered siting of Nos 30 to 34 relative to one another. I therefore consider that adopting the subservience measures promoted in the Design SPD would not benefit the area's appearance.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the side extension would be of an appropriate scale and design and that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy CS17 of the Fareham Local Development Framework Core Strategy of 2011 (the Core Strategy), the Design SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) because the development would be of scale and design that would be respectful of its surroundings.

Parking

9. Under the terms of the Council's Residential Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document of 2009 (the Parking SPD) dwellings with four or more bedrooms should have three parking spaces available to them. The application drawings show that No 30, as extended, would have three bedrooms plus a 'study', a room that I consider could be used as a fourth bedroom. I therefore consider that it would be appropriate for the extended property to have three off-street parking spaces available to it.
10. Under the provisions of the Parking SPD a garage will only be counted towards a dwelling's parking provision when it has dimensions of 6.0 by 3.0 metres. The Council has submitted that the garage would have dimensions of 3.9 by 2.5 metres and as such should not be counted for the purposes of the Parking SPD. In my experience a garage of the proposed dimensions would be too small to park most cars in. No 30 currently has two driveway spaces and the layout plan submitted with the appeal shows the drive could be extended sideways to provide a third parking space.
11. The details shown on the abovementioned layout plan indicate that there would be sufficient space to provide a third driveway parking space. With provision of that extra parking space the development would comply with the Parking SPD's requirements and I consider that this is a matter that could be addressed by the imposition of a planning condition.
12. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that it would be possible to provide sufficient off-street parking to meet the requirements of the Council's adopted parking standards and that there would be no harm to the safe operation of the highway. I therefore find that with the provision of a third driveway space there would be no conflict with Policies CS5 and CS17 of the Core Strategy, the Parking SPD and the Framework because an adequate level of off-street parking could be provided and the operation of the local road network would not be adversely affected by the development.

Conditions

13. Apart from the standard time limit condition, I find it necessary that the development should be built to accord with the submitted plans for certainty and be constructed with external materials matching those of No 30, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
14. For the reasons I have explained above it is necessary that three driveway parking spaces should be available prior to the first occupation of the side extension and be retained thereafter in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR