
Appeal Decision

by Richard Thomas BA DipArch RIBA IHBC

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

Site visit made on 1 July 2014

Decision date: 10 July 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/14/2218402

3 Bacon Lane, Hayling Island, Hampshire, PO11 0DN

- 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 S Truick against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/14/00079 was refused by notice dated 24 March 2014.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing garage and erect two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues in this case are;
 - (a) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
 - (b) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 5 Bacon Lane with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Council's "Borough Design Guide" Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) advises that side extensions should remain subservient to the main building. The two storey side extension in the proposed scheme would fail to adhere to this advice, in particular by way of its 0.9m projection above the existing ridge line and its width being around half that of the house.
4. The appellants contend the extension would act as an "end stop" that would complement the overall appearance of No 3 and reflect the design approach to other houses found in the street. However, as the Council rightly point out, the front elevation of the house is essentially divided into three sections by the gable projection that accommodates the front door. As a result, the house has a horizontal emphasis and a symmetry centred on the contrasting vertical emphasis of the central gable.
5. Owing to its width, as well as the features of the double garage door and the comparatively wide first floor window, the extension would overwhelm the front elevation, destroying its symmetry and creating an awkward hierarchy of scale

between the extension, central gable and dormers. This imbalance would contrast with the simple yet distinctive character of the existing house. In this particular case the design of the proposed "end stop" would therefore be inappropriate and the extension would generally appear overly dominant.

6. The front elevation of the development would be sited approximately 1m from the boundary with No 5. As noted by the appellants, there are examples of properties in Bacon Lane which extend across the width of their plots. However, there is a sense of spaciousness in this particular part of the street scene. This is derived from the gaps in the two storey built form found on either side of No 5, with the area located to the side of the appeal property making an important contribution in this regard.
7. Notwithstanding the set back from the boundary and the existence of the driveway to the side of No 5, I consider the development would erode the gap between the two storey built forms of No 3 and No 5 to such a degree that it would undermine the present sense of spaciousness. This harm would be perceptible from Bacon Lane despite the front boundary treatment.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thereby be contrary to policy CS16 of the Council's Core Strategy 2011 (CS), the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) and the SPD.

Living conditions

9. As the submitted plans indicate the rear elevation of the extension would be set back from the existing eaves, it would not directly obscure the ground floor kitchen window of No 5 or the bedroom window above to any significant degree. Nevertheless, as these rooms are not dual aspect the outlook from these windows is a particularly important consideration and this would reasonably take into account any development which is visible within a 45 degree sight line to either side of the windows.
10. In this regard, there is presently an acceptable relationship between the two properties owing to the separation distance between the windows and the flank wall of the appeal property. Notwithstanding the proposed set back from the boundary and the space afforded by the driveway to the side of No 5, the reduction in the separation distance and the increased bulk of the appeal property above ground floor level would result in the development appearing visually overbearing in the outlook from the windows concerned. The improved outlook from No 5 that would be derived from the demolition of the existing large detached garage at the appeal property would not outweigh the identified harm.
11. Accordingly, the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 5 with particular regard to visual impact. It would thereby be contrary to policy CS16 of the CS and the NPPF.

Other matters

12. It is understood the appeal proposal is a revised scheme from one previously submitted to the Council but subsequently withdrawn. Nevertheless, the changes made have not overcome the planning policy objections to the development.

13. The private benefit of the increased level of accommodation is acknowledged but this does not outweigh the greater public harm to the character and appearance of the area, or the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 5.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

R Thomas

INSPECTOR