

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/19/3220881

225 Brook Lane, Sarisbury Green, Southampton, SO31 7DS

- 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 Batchelor against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/18/0626/FP, dated 7 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear single-storey extension, a first-floor extension over existing garage space and remodel of the exterior appearance (render and cladding).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first-floor extension over the existing garage upon the living conditions at 227 Brook Lane, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling that occupies a corner plot at the junction of Brookfield Gardens with Brook Lane. The property has an existing, attached garage to one side with a utility room to the rear. This single-storey wing is set away from the boundary with 227 Brook Lane, a detached bungalow, by the width of a pedestrian access that leads to the rear. These dwellings are staggered in relation to each other, with No 227 set forward of the appeal property.
4. Part of the proposal includes a first-floor extension to the side and over part of the existing garage/utility room.
5. The rear garden to No 227 is shallow and compact, but it enjoys a pleasant and verdant setting, with typical height boundary enclosures to its rear and sides, and reasonable separation from surrounding dwellings with vegetation rather than buildings seen as most prominent in the background. This would change dramatically. The gap between the appeal property and the site's side

boundary is small and consequently the flank wall of the first-floor extension would run along the majority length of the adjoining rear garden's side boundary at close quarters.

6. Due to its height, length and proximity, the extension would impose itself upon the neighbour's rear garden space as a visually dominant and overbearing structure. This would create an intrusive and unnatural sense of enclosure that would significantly impact upon the neighbour's outlook and enjoyment of their rear private garden space. This would adversely impact upon the neighbour's living conditions and as such there would be direct conflict with the specific requirements of Policy DSP3 of the Farnham Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies (2014) insofar as it relates to such matters.
7. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR