



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J1725/D/21/3288687

20 Harwood Road, Gosport, PO13 0TT

- 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 Dan Dorricott against the decision of Gosport Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00520/FULL, dated 5 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side/rear extension to form annex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development as it appears on the decision notice as it better describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the corner (junction) of Harwood Road and Harwood Close and comprises a two storey semi-detached property with a single storey side outbuilding and detached single storey garage. The host property is set back from the road with hardstanding at the front for parking. The surrounding area largely comprises similar pairs of semi-detached properties, as well as a small terrace of properties, all of which are set back from the road, which vary in terms of some elevational details, roof form and pallet of materials. The result is a pleasant estate with the open front gardens and set back of the properties providing a sense of spaciousness and openness that makes an important contribution to the overall character of the area.
5. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a two storey side and rear extension to the host property. Whilst the new extension would be attached to the host, the proposal would largely comprise a replica of the host building set at a right angle with its main elevation facing onto Harwood Close and with a footprint that would not be dissimilar to that of the host. The proposal would be served by three new car parking spaces in front of the new extension accessed from Harwood Close.

6. Within the above context, the appeal proposal would result in a bulky and incongruous addition to the host property. It would not be sympathetic to or in proportion to the host, and would result in an awkward juxtaposition between the two. It would also not be subservient to the host and would visually dominate the streetscene. As I confirmed above, the area is largely characterised by pairs of semi-detached properties and the proposal would result in a development that fails to integrate with the existing pattern of built development. Overall, the proposed addition would not sit comfortably on the appeal site and due to its siting, layout and bulk it would reduce the openness and spaciousness at the road junction leading to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
7. These findings are supported by policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029 (October 2015) (GBLP) which, amongst other requirements, seeks to ensure that new development is well designed and respects the character of the distinctive built environments within the borough. Also, by the Council's Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document (February 2014) (SPD), which states that the design and appearance of the front of houses and their relationship to the street are important aspects in defining the character of residential areas. Consequently, the SPD states that two storey side extensions should be in scale and proportion to the existing building and should be set back from the front wall to ensure that they are visually subservient to the original building.
8. Whilst I accept that the removal of the existing single storey side outbuilding and detached garage would improve the appearance of the appeal site, this would not be sufficient to mitigate the harm I have identified above. Similarly, the examples of extensions referred to at No's 1 and 2 Harwood Road are not comparable to the appeal proposal, in that, as I observed on site, they involved single storey side extensions and roof alterations designed to be subservient and proportional to the original buildings. Neither these examples, nor the absence of any objections to the proposal affect, therefore, my findings on this issue.
9. The Council's Delegated Report highlighted concerns over the future use of the proposal and whether it would function as an annex given that it would contain all the facilities required to support a self-contained dwelling and due to it being a substantial building, with a level of autonomy and independent access and car parking. Whilst I agree with the Council that the appeal proposal could function as an independent dwelling, the development before me and the subject of this appeal is for an annex. There is no proposal before me for a separate dwelling and I have, therefore, determined the appeal on this basis.
10. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area contrary to policy LP10 of the GBLP and the SPD guidance.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR