
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2018

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/W/18/3204314

42 Maralyn Avenue, Waterlooville PO7 7LP.

- 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 J Pollard against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/17/01140, dated 19 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is a new end of terrace 2 bedroom dwelling within garden of number 42.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) came into force during the course of the appeal. The parties have been given the opportunity to comment on the implications of the guidance on the appeal, and I have also taken it into account in determining the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. 42 Maralyn Avenue is an end-of-terrace dwelling which occupies a visually prominent corner plot at the junction of Maralyn Avenue with Elmwood Avenue.
5. The terrace of which No 42 forms part has a unified, symmetrical design within which the frontages of 2 end dwellings are half rendered, and those at the centre are inset and half tile-hung. The roof form is staggered, rising with the ground level towards Elmwood Avenue. 2 similar terraces are located to the south east.
6. The proposed dwelling would be added to one end of the terrace. The roof would be stepped down, whereas other elements of the terrace rise towards the site, and the proposed dwelling would be narrower than others within in the terrace. Notwithstanding the similar frontage finish, the detailing would differ. As such the design of the proposed dwelling would fail to visually harmonise with that of the existing terrace. Clear differences in design would be highlighted by the adverse effect the development would have on the

symmetry of the terrace. The proposed dwelling would, as such, appear incongruous.

7. The terrace is set well back from the pavement providing a spacious frontage on Maralyn Avenue. This spaciousness continues around the side of No 42, where the generous gap provided between the end gable and pavement currently complements the similarly spacious layout of dwellings in Elmwood Avenue. The bungalow on the opposite side of Elmwood Avenue is also set back from the pavement, albeit the corner is less open than at No 42. Nonetheless this provides some sense of balance within the street scene.
8. The proposed development would almost fill the gap to the side of No 42, bringing the building form uncharacteristically close to the pavement. This would break the continuity of space around the corner, and conflict with the layout and spaciousness of development along Elmwood Avenue. The effect would be most appreciable, and would appear most obtrusive, travelling towards the appeal site along Elmwood Avenue. The harm caused would be accentuated by the significant visual imbalance that would be created either side of Elmwood Avenue as a result of the development.
9. The atypical proximity of the building to the pavement, combined with its height and massing, would furthermore cause the proposed building to appear overbearing within the established street scene. This would amplify the adverse effects noted above.
10. The appellant notes that dwellings adjacent to other junctions along Maralyn Avenue stand similarly close to the pavement. However the size of gaps in fact varies, as too the design of the buildings, and character of the street scenes within which they are viewed. As such the buildings noted are not directly comparable with that proposed.
11. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan Core Strategy 2011, which amongst other things seeks to secure development that responds to, draws inspiration from and respects the local context.

Other Matters

12. The Council acknowledges that its 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites makes an allowance for windfall, and the appeal scheme would make a contribution towards this. However there is no evidence before me to indicate that dismissal of the appeal would jeopardise the level of housing delivery within the District.
13. I note that officers provided favourable pre-application advice regarding the potential to provide a 2-storey extension. However whilst no design has been set before me, the appeal scheme is for a 2-storey dwelling as opposed to an extension. My consideration of the planning merits of the case has therefore remained unaffected.
14. Both parties agree there is a need to contribute towards mitigation of potential impacts on the Solent Special Protection Area. In this context the appellant has made a financial contribution secured by a Section 106 agreement, and submitted a further Unilateral Undertaking with regard to additional payments

the Council confirms have been made. Given my findings on the main issue however, this is not a matter I need to address further.

15. The appellant claims that the new dwelling would be 'affordable' and suited to a young family. However no evidence has been provided to indicate that the dwelling would conform to the definition of 'affordable housing' set out in the Framework Glossary. Occupation of the dwelling by a young family could not itself be guaranteed.
16. I also note the appellant's further comments that the dwelling would be well located with regard to existing services, that construction would provide work, and that no adverse effects on neighbours would arise. However these points do not outweigh the harm that I have identified with regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, and with regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR