The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2019

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/19/3226866
Little Hook, Hook Park Road, Warsash, Southampton SO31 9HE

- 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 & Mrs Paul and Emily Foley against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
- The application, Ref. P/18/0893/FP, dated 8 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2018.
- The development proposed is described on the application form as '*Re-drawn garage with accommodation above, extending the length and raising the ridge to the previously approved plans. Adding a carport for three vehicles which can be driven through. Timber weather board and tiles to match the house; courtyard driveway'.*

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a one and a half storey front extension with dormer windows; tiled canopy to the front; two additional dormer windows within the front roof slope; alterations to the front entrance; a single storey side / rear extension; alterations to the existing fenestration within the rear elevation, and detached car port with storage at Little Hook, Hook Park Road, Warsash in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. P/18/0893/FP, dated 8 August 2018, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;

    2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. PG 01; 02; 03; 04; 05; 06; 07; 08; 09; 10; 11;

    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 proposed en-suite dormer windows facing Meadow View shall be obscure glazed and of limited opening in accordance with details first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

    5) The front extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Little Hook, Hook Park Road, Warsash.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Notice of Refusal summarises the proposal in a more conventional form than the application and I have therefore used this wording in my Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the adjoining occupiers of Meadow View as regards outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal scheme is a substantial modification to the approved and part implemented extensions under reference P/16/0088/FP. I have seen these plans on the Council's website and have had regard to them in reaching my decision on this appeal.

5. On the first issue, the Council's concern is that the proposal would be harmful to the host dwelling in terms of design, scale and mass and that this would be detrimental to spaciousness and character of the area.

6. I acknowledge that the previously approved scheme, particularly the front extension, is a more subservient and conventional extension that is a better fit with the Council's design guidance. I also agree that it would be 'more respectful' of the existing characteristics of the host dwelling.

7. However, Little Hook is a building on a spacious plot that despite its proximity to Meadow View, the neighbouring dwelling, is well screened by mature trees and therefore seen in its setting as a stand-alone building.

8. In these circumstances there is an opportunity for more substantial extensions and alterations provided that, even with a more assertive approach and a change in character, the outcome is a building of good design that would sit comfortably in its rural surroundings.

9. On a detailed matter, I consider that the integral garage doors in the approved single storey front extension would be disproportionately large and appear unduly dominant. This would be remedied in the current proposal, but the more substantive point is that with its larger scale, and with the help of the car port the effective creation of a courtyard to the front of the building, the appeal scheme would have its own particular merits.

10. The pleasing enclosure created by the courtyard would be particularly apt in this setting of mature trees and hedges and would have the added advantage of reducing the existing dominance of the flank of Meadow View in the aspect from the existing driveway and parking area. There is a long tradition of substantial detached houses with courtyards in the English countryside and I can see no reason why Little Hook should not follow this example, albeit on a more modest scale than might usually be found with the more historic rural houses.

11. Turning briefly to the second issue, the front extension would be between 0.5m and 3m from the boundary with Meadow View for a length of 9m. However, this is part of that dwelling's garden between the rear wall and an outbuilding where the combination of the boundary fence, mature vegetation and the

existing house of Little Hook already preclude any longer views. The main aspect of Meadow View, as its name implies, is towards the open countryside to the north and north east and away from Little Hook.

12. Whilst I accept that the proposal would to some extent increase the sense of enclosure, the 1.5 storey height of the wall to the eaves would be 3.7m, above which the roof would slope away. In all the circumstances I consider that there would be little if any harmful effect on the outlook from Meadow View. And whilst in itself not determinative, I also note that the neighbour has not objected to the appeal scheme.

13. Overall, I conclude that there would be no harm caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling, its setting and the neighbours' living conditions. Accordingly, there would be no harmful conflict with Policy CS17 of the Fareham Borough Core Strategy 2011; Policy DSP3 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2: 'Development Sites and Policies' 2015; the Fareham Borough Design Guidance SPD 2015, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. I shall therefore allow the appeal.

14. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring matching external materials will safeguard the appearance of the house and its surroundings.

15. A condition restricting the use of the self-contained facilities in the extension to being ancillary to the host dwelling will prevent the potentially harmful establishment of a new dwelling in the countryside. Finally, a condition restricting the outlook from the two small dormers facing Meadow View will safeguard the neighbours' privacy.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR