



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2019

by A Thompson BSc BTP MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/19/3220036

49 St Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 0EU

- 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 Welch against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/18/01182, dated 16 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is for single storey rear and side extensions, two storey front extension. Dormer extensions to rear and front. Amended fenestration. Gabled roof (Re-submission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. I note that when validating the application, the Council changed the description to single storey rear and side extensions, two storey front extension. Dormer extensions to front and rear. Amended fenestration. Gabled Roof (Resubmission). As this is an accurate description of the proposal and was adopted by the applicants when making their appeal against refusal, I have amended the banner heading accordingly and determined the appeal on this basis.
3. Planning permission (reference APP/18/00753) was granted on 18 October 2018 for all the extensions and alterations that are now the subject of this appeal, except for the provision of a gable roof and additional glazing on the two storey front extension. It is clear that the appellants are keen to extend and alter the house and that they have a settled view on most of the work they want to undertake and this has planning permission, therefore the prospect of current permission being implemented is high. Accordingly, I give this extant permission considerable weight.
4. Given these considerations, I shall therefore concentrate on those parts of the development that were not the subject of the planning permission.
5. I also note that the parties submitted evidence which referred to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published in July 2018 and the submission of their evidence pre-dated publication of the updated Framework published in February 2019. As the policies in the current Framework that are

relevant to this appeal are unchanged from the version published in July 2018, it was not necessary to seek further evidence on this matter from the parties.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the gable roof and pattern of glazing proposed on the front two storey extension, on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

7. The properties on St Thomas Avenue have a variety of gabled and hipped roof arrangements, and directly opposite the appeal property are a number of bungalows with gable fronted extensions facing the road. In addition, I note that Nos 19-23 St Thomas Avenue comprise a row of two storey detached houses with steeply pitched gable fronted elevations.
8. However, many gables are on the side elevation of the properties and different styles of properties tend to be in groups or clusters of similar scale and design. The row of bungalows opposite the appeal site are far more modest in scale and of a different style and design to the appeal property. Similarly, although Nos 19-23 are visually quite prominent, they are some distance from the appeal site and are different in design to the appeal dwelling and the adjacent row of properties.
9. The appeal property sits towards the middle of a long row of detached buildings of similar chalet style, which have a mix of gabled and barn hipped roofs and front dormers. Despite the differences in detail, there is a strong degree of symmetry in their roofscapes as they all have their principal roof ridges running north south and their principal roof planes, of similar pitch, facing both east and west. While a number of these properties have gabled roofs, the gables are on the side, not the front, elevation of the property.
10. Both the scheme approved in October 2018, and the current scheme, include a two storey front extension which will project about 1.5 metres forward of the host dwelling.
11. When the Council approved the earlier scheme they decided that the use of a hipped roof form on the front extension, which both softens the visual prominence of the front extension and aligns with the roofscape of adjoining properties would, on balance, make that element of the scheme acceptable.
12. As I have indicated, I give great weight to the extant planning permission which already includes this front extension. But the addition of a gable roof would materially add to, and reinforce, the dominance of this feature on the street scene, because the gable roof is located at the highest point of the house, at a point that is closest to the road, and in the middle of row of properties of similar design.
13. Unlike a hipped roof, which would ensure a roof pitch which matched the pitch of the main roof and maintained an element of symmetry, a gable roof on the front elevation would markedly lengthen a feature (a roof ridge running east west) which would be disruptive to the rhythm of the roofscapes along the western side of this part of St Thomas' Avenue.

14. Although I give some weight to the potential benefit a gabled roof design and additional glazing might offer in terms of the spaciousness and outlook of the front bedroom, these factors do not outweigh the concerns outlined above.
15. The provision of an additional pane in the window on the ground floor elevation would satisfactorily balance and align the fenestration on the front elevation and would have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the local area.
16. The provision of glazing in the apex of the proposed gable is not found on any of the nearby properties, but I do not consider that it would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the local area, because it is relatively modest in scale and recessed behind the barge board and projecting gable of the proposed roof.
17. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of the glazing, I find that provision of a gable roof on the proposed front extension of the building would result in a visually intrusive feature in the street scene. This feature, because of its location, height and prominence and its lack of sympathy with the style and design of the host building, within a row of properties of similar design, would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the local area.
18. Accordingly the proposal would be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council, Borough Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the design policies of the Framework. These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development is designed to high standard with designs that complement or enhance the local area.

Other matters

19. In addition to the two storey front extension with amended fenestration, the appeal proposals also includes single storey rear and side extensions, dormer extensions to front and rear and amended fenestration. I agree with the Council's assessment that these other elements of the proposal are acceptable having regard to the provisions of the development plan and other considerations.
20. But the benefits that these improvements can offer to the occupiers of appeal property do not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the area by the provision of a gable roof on the proposed two storey front extension.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal must fail.

Anthony Thompson

INSPECTOR