

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2019

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/19/3225403

3 Lexden Gardens, Hayling Island PO11 0QP

- 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 & Mrs Stradwick against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/18/00985, dated 1 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor extension above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a detached two storey house within a row of similarly designed properties on a bend in the road which facilitates a staggered building line. Each dwelling at 1, 2 and 3 Lexden Gardens has an attached forward projecting flat roofed double garage, over which a first floor extension is proposed to be built on the subject dwelling.
4. The front elevation of the garage and the proposed extension is broadly in line with the principal two storey elevation of no 4; and with the exception of the relationship between nos 2 and 3, creates an almost unique situation within the close, whereby the built form of the proposal would be viewed against the backdrop of a blank gable end.
5. The extension has been designed to enable a degree of subordination to the host dwelling through the construction of a ridgeline lower than that of the main range, as well as a hipped gable to be provided on the front elevation. Taking into account the aforementioned staggered building line, and the relationship with no 4, on balance, I consider that the proposed extension by virtue of its overall scale, bulk and siting would not appear unduly incongruous within the street scene.
6. I note that with regard to the proposed cladding, the Planning Officer's Report highlighted that this would in part replace existing tile-hanging which is a

common feature on the majority of dwellings within the close. Consequently, to change this material to artificial weatherboarding, and in a completely different shade, would appear wholly out of character within the street scene. This harm would be further compounded by the fact that it would be applied to the most publically exposed elevations. Therefore, whilst I have no reason to doubt that the cladding would in theory upgrade the exterior of the appeal dwelling I consider that it would not be appropriate to its setting.

7. I note that the appellants state that they would be agreeable to the use of brick and tile hanging as an alternative if it was considered more appropriate by me, however to clad the whole of the southern and western elevations of the extension in tiles would in my mind be excessive. In the absence of a drawing to demonstrate the appellants' train of thought, I find that by reason of the cladding materials proposed, the extension would appear incongruous and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011 which requires development to be designed to a high standard and, amongst other things, use the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of new development including materials.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR