
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2018

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/W/18/3199971

48 Tournerbury Lane, Hayling Island PO11 9DG.

- 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 Wilkinson against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/17/01217, dated 10 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2018.
 - The development proposed is a side extension and alterations to divide existing dwelling into two properties.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy 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. 48 Tournerbury Lane occupies a visually prominent corner plot, with the front elevation facing Tournerbury Lane, and side elevation facing Beech Grove. Existing development within the surrounding area is of mixed character, though buildings along Beech Grove, and along the south side of Tournerbury Lane adjacent to the site are generally set well back from the pavement, and have spacious frontages. In the case of No 48 this spaciousness continues, albeit at a much reduced level, around the side of the dwelling, providing some sense of continuity with adjacent frontages on Beech Grove.
5. The proposed development would increase the length of the elevation facing Tournerbury Lane, and enlarge the existing gable feature at the front. The existing spacious frontage would be retained, and the appearance of the modified building would generally complement that of adjacent dwellings in Tournerbury Lane.

6. Elongation of the building form would at the same time reduce the current level of space on the corner given an increase the proximity of the side elevation to the pavement running along Beech Grove. The side elevation would as a result be closer to the pavement than that of the bungalow on the opposite side of Beech Grove, and also closer to the pavement than buildings on Beech Grove adjacent to the appeal site.
7. I note that since the appeal scheme was refused the Council has granted planning permission, reference APP/17/00556 (the approved scheme), for an extension at No 48 with an identical footprint to that of the appeal scheme. The loss of space on the ground, and between the side elevation and the pavement would be the same within appeal scheme as within the approved scheme.
8. The effects of the appeal scheme would nonetheless differ, given that rather than featuring a hipped roof, the extension would continue the roof form of the existing building, presenting a new gable end to Beech Grove. The proposed extension would thus have a more considerable mass, a blunter form, and greater height relative to the pavement. It would in consequence have a more significant visual presence within the street scene than the approved scheme.
9. Viewed relative to the generous set back of adjacent dwellings in Beech Grove, the extension would appear unduly prominent. The harm caused would be visually accentuated by the presence of a dormer very close to the gable end, which would increase the bulk and prominence of the extension further.
10. Notwithstanding the existing boundary wall, the uncharacteristically close proximity and height of gable relative to the pavement would furthermore cause it be appear overbearing. The adverse effect would be amplified when viewed relative to the set back of the dwelling on the opposite side of Beech Grove, and on account of the visual imbalance within the street scene that would arise.
11. These effects would, in combination, reduce the sense of spaciousness at the corner to a far greater more appreciable extent than within the approved scheme. The extension would as such appear both at odds with its setting visually intrusive within the street scene.
12. The appellant notes a similar proximity to the pavement of the gable end of the bungalow at the junction of Tournurbury Lane and Poplar Grove. The design of this bungalow however differs from that proposed, as does the character of the immediate setting, which I note is generally less spacious than that of the appeal site. As such this development has not affected my opinion of the appeal scheme.
13. 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

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.

Conclusion

15. 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