

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2013

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 October 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/13/2203040

21 Forest End, Waterlooville, Hants

- 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 L Bolt against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. APP/13/00428, dated 29 April 2013, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2013.
 - The development proposed is a rear first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and the wider locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached house situated within a residential estate. The predominant external facing materials to the elevations of dwellings within the immediate area are brick or pebble-dash render. No.19, due east of the appeal site, does however have hanging tiles to the first floor of its front and side elevations.
 4. To the rear of the existing dwelling is a large flat roof single storey extension which almost extends across the whole rear elevation of the dwelling, and which projects slightly beyond its main two storey flank elevation. It is proposed to erect a flat roof extension over it, albeit marginally narrower and 'set in' to both sides. Consequently the eastern elevation of the proposed extension would be flush with the existing flank elevation of the original dwelling, albeit clad in hanging tiles as opposed to pebble-dash render.
 5. Whilst I note that the Council do not raise an objection to the principle of a first floor extension to the property, I agree that by virtue of its positioning, design, appearance and scale that it would not sit comfortably on the rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension would be off set to the ground floor extension and would extend above the eaves height of the original dwelling, appearing as a discordant box-like addition. Further, the side elevation of the proposed
-

extension would also be visible from the street with the proposed hanging tiles being at odds with the existing rendered flank elevation. Therefore, in combination, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, as well as the wider locality.

6. I therefore find that the proposal is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) which requires development proposals to be of a high quality design, respond to and draw inspiration from and respect local context. Whilst I have not been provided with a copy of the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011), I also find the proposal in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and one of its core planning principles (in its paragraph 17) which is that planning should always seek to secure high quality design.
7. I acknowledge that no objections were raised from the occupants of neighbouring properties to the proposed development. Further, I appreciate the reasoning behind the appellant wishing to enlarge their property. They state that they would be happy to adjust the plans for the purposes of appearance and change the roof form if considered an issue. However no alternative design solutions have been produced and therefore for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR