

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2015

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/14/2222036

40 Newbarn Road, Bedhampton, Havant, Hants, PO9 3PX

- 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 Nathan Freeman against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/14/00281, dated 5 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2014.
 - The development proposed is '*Side and rear extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Southern Water, a statutory consultee, made representations on the appeal proposal regarding the existing public surface water sewer. The Authority recommended that either the existing apparatus be diverted, a full investigation be carried out to ascertain current capacity, the site layout be amended or a combination of these various measures be undertaken. Were I to allow this appeal I am satisfied, in the circumstances, that this issue could be dealt with by the imposition of either a suitable condition or a planning obligation on the landowner requiring for all appropriate measures to be carried out prior to the commencement of any construction works.

Main Issue

3. Given the above I consider the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling with open space available to the side of its southern flank wall. It is proposed that a part two/part single-storey side and single storey rear extension be erected. The two-storey element would be substantial, accommodating an additional bedroom and kitchen at ground floor level, two new first floor bedrooms and also, through the single storey element adjoining the rear, an extra lounge.
-

5. From the street the dwelling's frontage width, currently measuring approximately 6.5m would be increased by 4.2m, splaying to a maximum of 5.5m. This would amount to a total increase of some 85%, although the extension would be recessed from the existing front building line by 2.5m. It would seem apparent that the addition would have the potential to function as an independent self-contained unit but the internal layout does show connecting internal doors. As such, I will treat the proposal as an extension to the existing dwellinghouse.
6. At my site visit I noted nearby examples of two storey side extensions. The immediate neighbouring dwelling, No 42, has been extended at full ridge height, but to a lesser width than that of the appeal proposal, whilst No 34 has a relatively narrow, recessed addition which is set down from the main ridgeline. No evidence has been placed before me as to the planning status of the said extensions, nor when they were built but, in this connection, I must have regard to the recent Havant Borough Local Plan (LP), adopted in 2011, and also the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 2011 (SPD). Both of these documents, in common with the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012 (the Framework), provide contemporary guidance and place an emphasis on a high standard of design, advising that new development should take account of local character and its immediate context.
7. The SPD advises that side extensions should be subservient to the main building whilst also indicating that the extension's ridge height should be lowered beneath that of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the frontage. In this particular instance I consider that the extension's considerable width, height and design would not achieve any meaningful degree of subordination. In relation to the host dwelling it would appear as an unsympathetic addition or even an imposition thereto. Neither would it accord with local character, representing an incongruous addition to the street scene.
8. I have had regard to the appellant's personal circumstances and also other local properties which have been extended, mentioned in the grounds of appeal. Each extension, to varying degrees, will have their own particular planning merits, but their existence, along with the two examples I have cited, do not outweigh my concerns as to the harm that would result from the proposal.
9. I thereby conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area, and this would conflict with the requirements of LP Policy CS16, the SPD's objectives and also relevant advice contained within the Framework. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR