
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/16/3163818

14 Kelsey Close, Fareham PO14 4NW

- 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 Ian Hunter against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/16/1002/FP, dated 21 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage and construction of a two storey house extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Kelsey Close is characterised by two storey semi-detached and detached properties faced with a variety of materials. The buildings are set back from the road behind gardens and forecourts. Some have an attached garage or other single storey development to the side, but there is generally a significant gap to the neighbouring building, particularly at first floor level and above. The siting of the buildings relative to the highway and relative to one another contributes to the Close's open and fairly spacious character.
4. No. 14 forms one half of a semi-detached pair. It has an attached garage which abuts the boundary with no. 12. No. 12 has a two storey side extension which is set down slightly from that property's ridge line, and which at first floor level is set well back from its front face and set in from the boundary with no. 14.
5. The proposed extension would closely mimic the style, form and materials of the host. However, as its ridge would not be set down and its front face would not be set back relative to the host dwelling, it would not appear clearly subordinate to it. In that regard it would not comply with the advice in Section 1 of the Fareham Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Excluding Welborne) 2015 ('SPD') that side extensions should be set back from the front wall of the house, and that they look better if the ridge sits below the original roofline.

6. Moreover, the scheme's gable would be adjacent to the boundary with no. 12, and would thereby significantly close the gap above ground floor level between the host and its neighbour. Consequently, notwithstanding the staggered siting of these two dwellings, in many streetscene views the two pairs of prominently located semi-detached dwellings at the head of this cul-de-sac would appear as a continuous run of development more akin to short terrace. That would conflict with the Close's distinctive character of semi-detached and detached dwellings separated by significant gaps. The scheme would therefore not accord with the SPD's advice that when adding a side extension the gap between houses must be in keeping with the street's character.
7. Although the appellant states that he has no problem with the Council's guidance that an extension's ridge line should be lower than the existing ridge, and that its front wall should be set back, that was not the scheme that the Council's decision was based on, and I have no comprehensive set of drawings depicting such a proposal. Although the appellant provided with the appeal a revised sketch of the south-east elevation, as I understand it that was submitted to demonstrate his interpretation of the Council's requirements, rather than as a proposed amendment. I have based my decision on drawing no. 2015/2 which was submitted with the application, and which formed the basis of the public consultation.
8. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion that the proposed single storey rear element of the scheme would be acceptable. However for the reasons above I consider that the proposal as a whole would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with policy CS17 of the Fareham Borough Core Strategy 2011, and with the advice in the SPD.
9. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR