



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2019

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/W/19/3234746

Homewell, 7 Berewecke Road, Winchester SO22 6AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Dickens against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02927/FUL, dated 24 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage, store and utility room. Single storey extension to the front of the existing house. Alterations to the roof and fenestration of the existing house. New dwelling on the land to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the character and appearance of the area and (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located within an area of primarily residential character. Properties typically lie within spacious and leafy plots. The size of the plots, together with the degree of set back in relation to the road frontage, give the area a pleasant, suburban character. The proposal would entail the demolition of the existing garage, store and utility room to make way for a new two-storey dwelling, which would be built to the rear of the existing property.
4. The scale of the new dwelling would be excessive, particularly in respect of its two-storey height and its footprint, which would not appear proportionate to the size of the proposed plot. Whilst the existing property would screen parts of the proposal, it would nevertheless be readily visible within the street scene, by reason of its siting at the end of the driveway situated alongside the boundary shared with no 1 Berewecke Avenue.
5. In this context, by reason of its siting to the rear of no 7 Berewecke Road (no 7), the proposed dwelling would appear awkward and detract from the prevailing pattern of frontage development in the area. The assertive, contemporary design of the proposal is not objectionable in its own right, but would draw undue attention to the new building, only to emphasise further its

siting to the rear of no 7, and contrasting with the more traditional appearance of the surrounding buildings.

6. Whilst a small side garden would be provided as part of the proposal, the new dwelling would appear hemmed in on two of its boundaries and sit within proximity to the existing property, thus resulting in a cramped and congested form of development, which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would include the use of high quality materials and additional planting, which would also bring wildlife and ecology benefits. I also note that the appellants would be willing to accept a condition requiring the first floor element to be clad in timber. However, these considerations would not outweigh the harm which I have identified.
7. In reaching these conclusions, I have given consideration to the recently allowed appeal¹, which granted planning permission for the erection of a new two-storey dwelling on the adjacent site. This particular scheme was however assessed in the context of a corner plot and the erection of a house to the side of the existing property would be consistent with the prevailing pattern of development in the area. For these reasons, this appeal decision is considered of limited relevance to the proposal before me.
8. My attention has also been drawn to a number of residential developments, which are located within relative proximity to the appeal site. Limited information has however been provided in respect of the circumstances which led to these particular schemes being accepted. I cannot therefore be certain that these developments represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal which, in any event, I am required to assess on its individual merits.
9. For the reasons detailed above, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with the design aims of Policy CP14 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy² (LPP1), Policies DM15, DM16 and DM17 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations³ (LPP2), as well as the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document⁴ (SPD).

Living conditions

10. The proposed dwelling would be constructed alongside parts of the boundaries shared with nos 14 Bereweek Close (no 14), nos 1 and 3 Bereweek Avenue (nos 1 and 3). It is noted that the building would be partially sunken and that the first floor element would be sited further away from the shared boundaries. The existing garage at no 1 would also screen part of the proposed dwelling. Nevertheless, by reason of the overall bulk and height of the proposed built form, as well as the proximity to the garden areas of nos 14, 1 and 3, the appeal scheme would introduce a form of development which would be visually intrusive and overbearing to the occupiers of this neighbouring properties. In respect of no 14, the visual harm would be compounded by the removal of part of the existing hedge, despite the installation of a new boundary fence.

¹ APP/L1765/W/18/3193896.

² Adopted March 2013.

³ Adopted April 2017.

⁴ Adopted March 2015.

11. Interested parties are also concerned that the proposal would overlook neighbouring properties. However, existing forms of boundary treatments, which to a large extent are proposed to be retained as part of the proposal, would ensure that the privacy of neighbouring residents is safeguarded in respect of the ground floor windows. At first floor level, the proposal would include the formation of a bathroom window on the side elevation facing towards no 1, which is proposed to be obscure glazed.
12. Equally, the position of the window serving the staircase would ensure that the privacy of neighbouring residents is protected. Views from the proposed bedroom window would be restricted to the mature trees situated within the south-west corner of no 1. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not cause any significant loss of privacy for the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, it is accepted that by reason of the orientation of the proposed dwelling in relation to these neighbouring properties, the appeal scheme would not give rise to overshadowing.
13. For the reasons detailed above, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore fail to accord with LPP2 Policy DM17 and the High Quality Places SPD which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining properties by being overbearing.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR