
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/19/3232872
15 Owen Close, Fareham PO16 7GZ

- 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 S Juma against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/19/0307/FP, dated 23 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear infill at the side and back of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area;
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a detached 'L shaped' dwelling located within a cul-de-sac of a predominately residential area of Fareham. The appeal site is within a relatively new housing estate, which is characterised with high housing density and a variety of architectural styles and plot sizes.
4. The appeal proposal is for a two storey in-fill extension which would abut the boundary with the neighbouring properties on Wickham Road. The section of the proposal closest to the boundary would have an eaves height of approximately 5 metres and a ridge height of 5.7 metres. The central part of the proposal would have an eaves height of 5 metres and a ridge height of approximately 7 metres to match the existing.
5. The appeal proposal would be of considerable scale and mass. Whilst the proposal would have a similar eaves and ridge height as the host dwelling, the scale and mass of the proposal means it would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. It would therefore appear as a dominant addition, and as such harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

6. The proposal would remove a significant amount of garden space within the appeal site. Whilst the wider estate has a variety of plot sizes, from the plans submitted by the appellant larger dwellings in the surrounding area generally have good size gardens which match the size of the dwellings. Given the relatively high density of the estate, these garden spaces serve an important role in breaking up the built form. The scale of the proposal means it would significantly reduce this garden space and dominate the plot. This would not be in keeping with the character of surrounding properties on the estate. Accordingly, the proposal fails to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. The appellants have stated that the proposal would only be barely visible from the public domain and is therefore not visually intrusive. I do not find this would be the case. The appeal site is visible from a number of locations within Owen Close, as well as from a number of neighbouring occupiers. The increased scale and mass would be a clearly new discernible feature of the property.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such it conflicts with Policy CS17 of the Fareham Local Development Framework Core Strategy adopted August 2011. This policy seeks, amongst other things, that development is of a high-quality design which responds positively to the characteristics of the area. It would also be contrary to the guidance within the Fareham Borough Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2015 which amongst other things, seeks that development is of a high-quality design that respects the existing character of the area.

Living conditions

9. The appeal site abuts Nos 62-68 Wickham Road, and the appeal proposal would be constructed along this boundary of the site. The construction of a two-storey extension of this scale in this location would lead to a sense of enclosure of these rear gardens. The scale and mass of the proposal would be a dominant and overbearing feature from within these gardens. The impact would be more significant for Nos 68 and 66, where the rear gardens would abut directly to the proposal. This would likely lead to overshadowing and a loss of daylight within these gardens. Given the close proximity of the proposal and the increased mass would lead to an increasing feeling of enclosure for all of these properties as the built form would be much closer to the rear of their gardens. I therefore find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of Nos 62-68 Wickham Road with particular regard to their outlook.
10. I note that occupiers of neighbouring properties on Wickham Road have concerns that the proposal would harm their privacy. Whilst the proposal includes a new window on the first floor elevation which overlooks these gardens, this window would serve a bathroom and be obscured glazing. I am satisfied that this would ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupiers would be protected, and this could be adequately secured through the use of a planning condition. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.
11. Accordingly, although I do not have any concerns with regard to privacy, I find that proposal harms the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook. As such it conflicts with Policy DSP3 of the

Fareham Local Plan Development Site and Policies adopted June 2015. This policy seeks, amongst other things, that development does not have an adverse impact upon living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other matters

12. The appellants have indicated that they require the proposal to provide additional space for their growing family. Whilst I have given these personal circumstances careful consideration, they are outweighed by the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the impact of the living conditions of neighbouring properties, which is at odds with the development plan, and is a matter of significant weight against the proposal.

Conclusions

13. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR