
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2018

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/17/3188647

8 Post Office Road, Waterloooville, PO7 5LS

- 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 R Ewins against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/17/00992, dated 11 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 25 Crofton Close (No.25), with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Post Office Road is a narrow back street which provides vehicular and/or pedestrian access to a number of traditional and modern houses and other buildings. The Appeal dwelling is located at the eastern end of two rows of traditional terraces with uniform front elevations. These terraces are characterised by their tall chimneys; varied roof heights, with half hip details; staggered front building lines; part rendered and part red brick walls; and open timber porches. They pick up on the traditional features of the adjacent older properties which front onto London Road and make a valuable contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. Immediately to the east of the Appeal site are a row of three pairs of modern semi-detached houses, whose front and rear building lines are set further to the south of those of the Appeal dwelling.
5. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that new development should reflect the identity of local surroundings and add to the overall quality of the area. At the same time, the NPPF seeks to improve the conditions in which people live.

6. Consistent with this, policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 (Core Strategy) requires development to be designed to a high standard. Its design should respond to and respect local context and respond positively to the local character. New development should not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties through its impact on their outlook.
7. The Council's Borough Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) advises that side extensions should be subservient to the host dwelling, so that they are visually distinct from the original dwelling. This can be achieved by lower ridge lines and the extensions being set back behind the front building line of the host dwelling. It is also important to keep gaps between buildings where they influence local character. With this in mind the SPD states that in general, extensions should be at least two metres from the side boundary of the site.
8. The open gap to the side of the Appeal dwelling is consistent in size to the gap between the two older terraces, although materially wider than the plots of any of the other older terraced dwellings. It is also materially wider than the gaps between the pairs of dwellings immediately to the east. As a consequence, the reduction in the size of the gap between the Appeal dwelling and the side boundary of the Appeal site to some three metres would be consistent with the spatial characteristics of the row of dwellings. It would also be generous when compared to the local area in general.
9. In many respects the proposed extension reflects the prevailing character and appearance of the host terrace, with its recessed front building line, front gable feature, the use of half hips and its general design detailing. However, the continuation of the existing ridge line of the eastern section of the host dwelling would result in a long ridge line and wide expanse of roof. It would appear unduly bulky and out of scale with the host dwelling and would detract from the modest proportions and strong vertical lines of the host dwelling.
10. As a consequence, the proposal would detract from and undermine the character, appearance and quality of the two terraces and would fail to respond positively or add to the quality of the area. This harm would outweigh the benefits of the scheme for the Appellant and their family that would result from the additional accommodation.
11. For this reason, I conclude on the first main issue that the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the character of the area, contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the SPD.

Living conditions

12. The rear elevation of the dwelling at No.25 is orientated slightly towards the Appeal site and the proposed extension would project several metres beyond the rear building line of the dwelling at No.25. The proposed extension would also be located to the west and some 3.3 metres from the adjacent rear garden at No.25. As a consequence, notwithstanding the existing tall boundary hedge, the proposed extension would be unduly prominent and would dominate the north-westerly outlook from both the dwelling and rear garden at No.25. It would result in a strong sense of enclosure, which would be exacerbated by the unfavourable northern aspect of the rear windows of the dwelling and much of the garden at No.25.

13. It is acknowledged that the extension would fall outside the 45 degree line and so would not result in a material loss of daylight or sunlight within the adjacent rooms at No.25. In addition, the roof of the extension would be hipped away from No.25. However, due to its combined depth, height and juxta-position the proposed extension would have an unduly enclosing impact on the outlook from the rear of No.25.
14. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.25 due to its overbearing and enclosing visual impact. The scheme would therefore conflict with policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the SPD.

Conclusion

15. The conclusions on both main issues represent compelling reasons for dismissing this Appeal, which could not be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR