



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2011

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 July 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2154748
27 Haven Road, Hayling Island PO11 9RY

- 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 Martin Bowling against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: APP/11/00012, dated 10 December 2010, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2011.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 1.2m high picket fence and a pair of 1.8m high double gates along the southern boundary and a 1.8m high close boarded fence along the eastern boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 1.2m high picket fence and a pair of 1.8m high double gates along the southern boundary and a 1.8m high close boarded fence along the eastern boundary, at 27 Haven Road, Hayling Island PO11 9RY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: APP/11/00012, dated 10 December 2010.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal can most appropriately be described as given in the header above and it is on the basis of this description that the appeal will be considered. The fencing and gates have already been erected but the proposal must, nevertheless, be considered strictly on its own planning merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the consideration of this appeal is the effect of the double gates on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The fencing, gates and associated dwelling are located at the corner of Haven Road and Bosmere Road. Properties in the vicinity of the site generally have enclosed front gardens and the boundary treatments vary significantly. These include hedges, walls and vertically boarded and close boarded fences. There is also a nearby close boarded fence at the corner of Haslemere Gardens and Bosmere Road. This is of a broadly comparable height to the double gates and
-

close boarded fence at the appeal site and is also of a significantly greater length than these means of enclosure taken together.

5. The picket fence extends across the major part of the southern boundary fronting onto Haven Road and forms the dominant roadside feature. Because of the gaps between the vertical posts it has a significant degree of transparency. Together with the relatively modest height, this gives the front garden of the property a significant degree of openness. This is the case despite the greater height and solidity of the gates at the eastern end of the front boundary, which are of a noticeably shorter length.
6. There is a hedge of a similar height next to the gates and close boarded fence that softens their impact and integrates them into the streetscene. The double gates are also seen in conjunction with the relatively prominent close boarded fencing of a similar height along the side boundary with the dwelling to the north, when looking eastwards from Haven Road.
7. Because of all the above factors, the gates do not appear incongruous in the streetscene and are appropriate to their context. A photograph submitted by the Appellant shows that they replaced a section of close boarded fencing of a broadly similar height and visual impact, which is also a factor in favour of the appeal.
8. As a result, it is concluded that the character and appearance of the area has not been harmed. The proposal responds to, draws inspiration from and respects the local context, in accordance with this aim of Havant Borough Core Strategy, Local Development Framework, March 2011, Policy CS16.
9. An interested party has expressed concern about possible encroachment onto highway land. However, the Council has raised no objections in this regard, so that the rejection of the appeal on this basis would not be justified. Taking account of all other matters raised, it is therefore determined that the appeal succeeds. The comments of a local resident regarding the acceptability of the proposal are therefore justified. In this case, as the development has already been constructed, there is no need for any conditions.

M Evans

INSPECTOR