



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on Wednesday 6 February 2019

by Martin S. Lee, MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/W/18/3218346

52, Keyes Road, Gosport, Hampshire PO13 0JA

- 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 Muscat against the decision of Gosport Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/0039/FULL, dated 21 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear single storey extension and dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development has changed from that included in the application form to that stated on the decision notice issued by the LPA. Although I can find no written acceptance by the appellant for the change, I agree that the description contained in the application form was flawed and find that provided in the decision notice more accurate.
3. Accordingly, I agree with the Local Planning Authority ('LPA') that change was required to identify the full physical extent of external extension proposed to the roof (albeit that this component will facilitate the associated internal works required to achieve the loft conversion referred to in the original description of development contained on the application form).
4. The reason for refusal does not appear to provide clear differentiation between the two elements of the proposed development. I shall, therefore, work on the basis that the use only of the word 'extension' (and lack of reference to 'dormer window') in the reason provided reflects the LPA's use of the word in their description of development and thus means that their objection relates solely to the single storey element of the proposal. This is reinforced by the content of paragraph 5 of the LPA officer report supporting the decision which confirms they have no issue with any assessed impacts of the proposed rear dormer.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality/area;

- living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The overall length and height of the proposed single storey extension fails to demonstrate any degree of subservience to the footprint and form of the existing two storey dwelling. Its scale, mass and design would result in it becoming the more dominant element of the built form. It is primarily the length (when combined with breadth and overall height) of the extension which would create a proposal so substantial that it would be disproportionate in scale to the host building. This would be exacerbated by the gabled design of the extension which would reinforce/exacerbate the extent of its projection from the rear of the two storey building.
7. Although the appellant argues that the LPA has not justified its desire for a reduction in the length of the extension, there is no sufficiently persuasive argument from the appellant as to why the proposed ground floor extension essentially requires the floor area shown on the submitted drawings.
8. I find that the proposal would be an overly dominant and unduly prominent addition, harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality/area. It would conflict with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, the Design SPD and paragraphs 124, 126, 127 and 130 of the Framework which, when taken as a whole, seek to ensure high quality design.

Living conditions

9. The visual dominance of the extension would create an excessive sense of enclosure and loss of outlook for the attached dwelling, exacerbated by the proximity and height of the proposal in relation to the side boundary. The lack of apparent objection from current neighbours is noted, but this is not sufficient to overcome the assessed negative impacts upon all potential occupiers, not just those who reside there at this present time. Insufficient space between the proposal and the common garden boundary has been given to allow for any landscaping that might otherwise have been considered to ameliorate this impact.
10. For these reasons, I conclude the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.50 Keyes Road, in terms of outlook. The proposal would conflict with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan, the Design SPD and paragraphs 124, 126, 127 and 130 of the Framework which seek to ensure high quality design and safeguard neighbouring amenity.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin S. Lee

INSPECTOR