



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/21/3281076

8 Titchfield Road, Stubbington, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 2JH

- 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 Mrs Diana Deary against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/21/1016/FP, dated 4 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a 3.0 m x 6.0 m single storey garage. Timber framed, with all materials to be matched to existing and black cladding. 3.8 m height pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have adopted the description of development on the application form as this describes the appeal proposal more fully.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the north eastern side of Titchfield Road. The host property comprises a single storey semi-detached bungalow with rooms in the roof. It forms part of a row of similar semi-detached bungalows to the west (Nos 8 to 18 (even) Titchfield Road), with, to the east, a more modern two storey development (No. 6A Titchfield Road). All of these properties are set back from the road with their frontages taken up by parking, driveways and landscaping.
5. Opposite the appeal site are a mix of old and new two storey houses sited on or close to the back edge of the pavement. To the south east of the appeal site Titchfield Road ends at a roundabout. However, to the north west, Titchfield Road does continue further but due to a bend in the road the properties immediately beyond No. 18 are not that visible and do not therefore form part of the appeal sites immediate context.
6. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a large single storey garage within the frontage to the host property, on an area currently used for

- parking. The submitted location plan indicates that the new building would be sited about equal distance between the main front wall of the host property and its front boundary wall to the road. It would therefore be sited well in front of the building line that is formed by the host property and No's 10 – 18 (even), as well as No.6A. The proposed building would occupy a prominent location and would be highly visible. It would appear completely out of keeping with its immediate context and would fail to respond positively to the prevailing built form and open character of the frontages to No's 6A to 18 (even).
7. There are no other similar outbuildings within this part of Titchfield Road and as I confirmed above, there is a well established building line formed by No's 6A to 18 (even). The scale and overall ridge height of the proposed building would make it highly visible in the streetscene, when travelling in either direction on Titchfield Road. As I observed on my site visit, Titchfield Road is a busy 'B' road and appears to be a popular route for pedestrians. From these public vantage points the proposed building would dominate the open frontage of the appeal site and adjoining properties. It would result in a marked change in the appearance of the site and the character of this part of the streetscene.
 8. The appellant refers to the improvements they have undertaken to the host property. However, this does not mitigate against the significant harm I have identified. They have also referred to the large mobile home parked in the front garden, but this is a temporary and moveable feature, whereas the appeal proposal is for a permanent new building.
 9. Reference has also been made to other structures within the front gardens of No's 30 and 82 Titchfield Road. However, I concur with the Council that these are not comparable to the appeal proposal and are not visible from the appeal site, and thus do not form part of its immediate context. Even so, I do not know the full planning circumstances of these cases and I have, as required, considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits having regard to the particular circumstances of the case, specifically the impact of the proposed building on the character and appearance of this part of Titchfield Road.
 10. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would be contrary to policy CS17 of the Fareham Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) which seeks to ensure that new development responds positively to and is respectful to the key characteristics of an area including its spaciousness and built form. It would also be contrary to the corresponding policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) and section 1 of the Council's 'Design Guidance' Supplementary Planning Document (2015) which advises that new garages in front gardens will only be allowed where other similar buildings exist and where they would occupy a similar building line.

Conclusions

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

G Roberts

INSPECTOR