
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/19/3240381

14 Sumar Close, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 2EA.

- 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 and Mrs Fronda against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/19/0793/FP, dated 29 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey rear extension with a single storey extension attached and new front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed extension on the architectural integrity of the host property; and,
 - b) the proposals effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in terms of its potential to be overbearing and to result in a harmful loss of outlook.

Reasons

First main issue

3. The property the subject of this appeal 14 Sumar Close, is a detached two-storey dwelling, set in a large garden plot and located within an established small residential development.
4. The appellants propose a two-storey rear/single storey side extension and a front porch addition. A similar extension was granted planning permission in July 2019 (Ref: P/19/0308/FP).
5. The Council do not raise any objections to the proposed porch. From what I have seen and read I would not form a contrary view. However, the ground floor addition was previously proposed to project 7.0 metres from the house and the first floor addition just 5.4 metres. The first floor of the appeal design is proposed now to project 7.0 metres, the same depth as the ground floor. The design also includes a single storey lean-to extension on the western side of the proposed two-

storey addition and for a screen of tress to be planted along its western side between the proposed extension and the boundary to number 12.

6. While maintaining the existing eaves line of the roof the ridge of the proposed extension would be set down below that of the host property. Nevertheless, in my judgement, due to the three dimensional form and mass of the overall extension and the large unattractive areas of unbroken brickwork, particularly to the rear elevation, the proposed addition would appear as an alien and overly dominant feature.
7. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposal would, if built as designed, cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the original design of the host property. It would therefore not accord with Policy CS17 of the adopted Fareham Local Development Framework - *Core Strategy* (Adopted August 2011) and the Fareham Borough Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted December 2015) (SPD) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development.

Second main issue

8. The proposed extension would be located some distance from the boundary with number 12. The single storey element would be the closest, set off the boundary by between some 1.0 to 3.5 metres.
9. The side elevation of the extension given the lack of any modelling or relieve from the large area of brickwork at first floor level would appear unattractive and dominant. However given the overall separation distance to the boundary I am not persuaded, on balance, that it would be either so overbearing or result in such a significant loss of outlook as to cause harm the living conditions of the occupiers of number 12.
10. Nevertheless, any proposed screening/soft landscaping located in the gap between the ground floor addition and the common boundary would need to be very carefully considered if it was to be both effective and not cause harm, by for example overshadowing the habitable room of the neighbouring dwelling. This is however a matter that if I were minded to allow the appeal could be addressed by a suitably worded condition.
11. I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed development would not, on balance, cause harm to the living conditions of the residential occupiers of number 12. If allowed, subject to a landscaping condition, it would accord with Policy DSP3 of the Fareham Local Plan Part 2: *Development Sites and Policies* (Adopted June 2015) and the SPD as they relate to the protection of residential amenity.

Conclusions

12. Having had regard to all matters I have concluded that the proposal would not, subject to a landscaping condition, adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of number 12. However, it would result in unacceptable harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and for that reason the appeal should not succeed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR