



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/22/3290370

18 Fairview Drive, Hythe SO45 5GY

- 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 Tim Yonoff against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/11557, dated 16 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is to raise the roof of the bungalow to add an additional first floor storey.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development having regard to 1) the character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area; and 2) the living conditions of the occupants of 20 Fairview Drive in respect of outlook and overbearing impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site relates to a detached bungalow on Fairview Drive with a driveway and off-street parking to the front. It is located within a row of other modest bungalows and chalets. The neighbourhood is predominantly residential in nature.
 4. The proposal is for an additional storey over the bungalow, with the resultant scheme broadly replicating the depth, width and features of the current building, albeit at an increased height. To my mind, the extent of development would not be sympathetic to the diminutive scale of the existing bungalow and those properties to either side. The cumulative impact of the mass and bulk at first floor level, together with the substantial gable element facing the front, would appear dominant and obtrusive within the context of the local streetscene.
 5. I recognise that the wider area contains dwellings of differing size and scale, including a two-storey residence opposite the appeal land. However, this house is significantly narrower at first floor level than that proposed, and does not include a large and prominent front gable feature. Therefore I do not consider that it is comparable to the scheme before me.
-

6. I acknowledge those other matters that have been advanced in support of the development, including the use of complementary materials, the renovation of a dwelling in a poor state of repair, the suitability of the large rear garden for a family dwelling and that there have been no objections from local residents or the Parish Council. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified above.
7. I am aware that permitted development rights can be used as a fallback position; the appellant highlights Class AA of the General Permitted Development Order. However, there is no evidence before me that prior approval has been granted by the Council in this respect, and as such I consequently afford any fallback situation limited weight.
8. I conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would fail to meet Policy ENV3 of the New Forest District Local Plan Part 2 (2014) and Policies D1 and D3 of the Hythe and Dibden Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2026, which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Living conditions

9. The new first floor would significantly increase the size and scale of development facing 20 Fairview Drive, thereby adding material bulk to the built form in close proximity to the common boundary.
10. In doing so, this would create a considerable extent of development which would dominate the outlook from the side windows of No. 20, and the environment in and around its driveway and front garden. This would be in a manner which would be overbearing and oppressive, and materially worse than the existing state of affairs.
11. The proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 20 Fairview Drive with regard to outlook and overbearing impact. It would conflict with Policy ENV3 of the New Forest District Local Plan Part 2 (2014), which seeks to ensure that development does not prejudice the environment or amenity of the occupiers of adjacent properties.

Conclusion

12. Having taken full account of all of the matters before me, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR