



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 February 2020

by Christopher Miell MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/19/3239734

24 Wheatland Close, Winchester SO22 4QL

- 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 K Kostiw against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01408/HOU, dated 26 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling, which is positioned on the northern side of Wheatland Close. The property has an integral single storey garage to the side of the dwelling and the appeal site slopes downwards from the roadside. The proposal is for a single storey extension to the front of the existing dwelling, which would extend the full width of the host building.
4. The surrounding area has a suburban residential character and the properties on Wheatland Close are typically two-storey detached dwellings. The properties are of a traditional design and appear to date from the same architectural period. Whilst there are different property designs present within the street, such as different bay window placements, the properties are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance, which contributes positively to the local distinctiveness of the area.
5. Despite the existing site levels and the fact that the proposed extension would broadly align with the building line of the front projection of the neighbouring property, the width of the proposed front extension across the entire frontage of the existing dwelling is such that it would give rise to a prominent feature that would be significantly at odds with the appearance of the host building and out of keeping with the surrounding dwellings located within Wheatland Close. Consequently, when viewed in the context of the surrounding area, the proposal would appear as an unduly prominent form of development, which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to several properties on Silverwood Close and Rooks Down Road, which have extensions to the front of the host building. However, the respective development is not directly seen in the context of the appeal site and does not therefore contribute directly to the aforementioned and distinctive characteristics of the local area. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits.
7. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (April 2017) which requires new development to respect the qualities, features and characteristics that contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area; and to respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment, within and surrounding the site, in terms of its design, scale and layout.
8. In addition, and for the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the guidance relating to front extensions contained within the Winchester City Council High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (March 2015).

Other Matters

9. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation, which would improve the existing living conditions for the appellant and future occupiers. Whilst I acknowledge that opportunities to extend the appeal property to the rear of the building may be limited due to the depth of the rear garden, such benefits would not be significant enough to alter or outweigh my conclusions on the main issue.

Conclusion

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

Christopher Miell

INSPECTOR