APPDECNO

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2010

by David Prentis BA BPI MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
20 August 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/10/2132777
12 Claremont Gardens, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO7 5LL

- 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 Andrew Merefield against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref 10/61556/000, dated 8 February 2010, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2010.
- The development proposed is a part single storey, part two storey side extension.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a part single storey, part two storey side extension at 12 Claremont Gardens, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO7 5LL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 10/61556/000, dated 8 February 2010, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

   3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ANA/OCT/001, 002, 003, 004, 005 Rev A, 006, 007 and 008 and ANA/FEB/008, 009 and 010.

Preliminary matters

2. In its decision notice the Council used a simplified version of the description of development set out in the application form. I have adopted the description used by the Council in this decision.

3. The Council's reason for refusal refers to a policy of the South East Plan (SEP). On 6 July 2010 the Secretary of State announced the revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies, including the SEP, so this policy is no longer relevant. However, insofar as the policy was relevant at the time of the Council's decision, I consider that it had the same objectives as Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 (LP) which is also referred to in the reason for refusal. Consequently, I do not think that the revocation of the SEP has resulted in a material change in the policy context for this appeal.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey detached house with a hipped roof standing at the head of a cul-de-sac within a modern suburban residential estate. The house has a projecting two storey bay with a gable on the right hand side of the front elevation. There is a single storey projecting bay, also with a gable, on the left hand side.

6. To my mind the design of the extension would be well related to the host building. It would have a hipped roof and the proportions and style of the first floor windows would reflect those of the original building. The two storey extension would be set well back from the front elevation and it would have a ridgeline substantially below that of the main roof. Consequently, it would be seen as a subservient addition. Subject to the use of matching facing materials, a matter which could be covered by a condition, it would cause no harm to the street scene.

7. The Council is critical of the width of the extension which, it suggests, should be reduced to match the width of the gabled bays. I do not consider that this requirement is justified. The proposal would be a modest addition which would not compete with or replicate the gabled bays. In my opinion the proposed extension would form a harmonious composition with the existing building.

8. The Council also suggests that the first floor windows should be closer together, to match the right hand bay, and that the small single storey extension should have a window. However, in practical terms I consider that these minor changes would make very little difference to the way the building would be perceived in the street scene.

9. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. I find no conflict with LP Policy D1 which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development respects and enhances local character.

10. The Council has suggested conditions which I have considered in the light of Circular 11/95 *The use of conditions in planning permissions*. As noted above, I agree that there should be a condition regarding matching materials to protect the appearance of the street scene. A condition requiring development to be in accordance with the approved plans should be imposed to reflect the advice in *Greater Flexibility for Planning Permissions.* However, a suggested condition relating to additional window openings is not necessary because the normal limitations on permitted development rights would be sufficient to avoid harmful overlooking.

David Prentis

Inspector