



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2011

by David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT

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

Decision date: 22 December 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2165079

69 Newbarn Road, Bedhampton, Havant, Hampshire PO9 3PY

- 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 Matthew Bullock against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/11/00962, dated 10 May 2011, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2011.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extension firstly on the appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining houses and secondly on the character of the overall street scene.

Reasons

Host Dwelling

3. The host property sits within a terrace of four dwellings which have retained their symmetry. The outer two units form gable ends and the inner two dwellings are slightly set back and both have small open flat roofed porches to the front.
4. The proposed extension, which includes a bay window to the front, would extend about 2.3m beyond the existing front elevation, it would be over 6.5m in width and would be about 3m in height at the highest point. Although a condition could be imposed regarding the use of appropriate materials, the scale, depth, width and appearance of the extension would appear incongruous in relation to both the host dwelling and the remainder of the terrace and the symmetry of the frontage would be lost.
5. On the first issue I conclude that the proposed extension would detract from the appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole. The requirements of policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (HBCS), which seek to ensure that the design of development would be of a high standard and would reflect the characteristics of the locality, would not be met.

Street Scene

6. On the other side of the road to the terrace is a visually significant triangular area of open green and despite a small change in levels there are clear views across the green to the host property and the terrace within which it sits, from both Newbarn Road and Mitchell Road. The current view is of the symmetrical frontage to the terrace and this adds quality to the street scene. The proposed extension would be a visually prominent addition to the dwelling, would unbalance the symmetry of the terrace and it would be readily apparent to passers-by.
7. The appellant refers to a number of other extensions that have been allowed nearby and I saw some of these on my visit. I do not have all the details of those works and in any I event must determine this appeal on its own merits. Nevertheless there were none which displayed identical locational characteristics to the appeal site and although it is not a matter on which my decision turns, the appearance of some of the extensions confirm the damage that can be caused to the character of the street scene by the erection of unsympathetic extensions.
8. On the second issue I conclude that the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the character of the street scene. HBCS policy CS16 requires development to respect the local context and that requirement would not be met.

Other Matters

9. The appellant states that the neighbours at number 71 have been granted planning permission for a front extension. However, I have been given no evidence that there is a current permission for such development and can therefore give the statement little weight.
10. I have taken into account the Draft National Planning Policy Framework but because of its current status I have attached only little weight to its contents.
11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

David Hogger

Inspector