The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2012

by C J Leigh BSC(HONS) MPHIL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 May 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/12/2173095
31 Park Crescent, EMSWORTH, PO10 7NT

- 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 & Mrs A Gardner against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref APP/11/01822 was refused by notice dated 23 January 2012.
- The development proposed is erection of single storey garage to the front (north) of existing house.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly, the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, secondly, the living conditions of the adjoining occupier at 33 Park Crescent.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Park Crescent is an attractive residential road with diversity in the appearance of houses. A common feature is the set-back of properties from the road. The appeal property is one of a pair of houses that is evidently a later addition to the street, and both properties show that set-back from the street frontage. There are garages to the properties either side of No. 31 that project forward from the front elevation.

4. The proposed extension would provide a garage, repositioned front entrance and additional accommodation for the house. I share the Council's concerns relating to the form and scale of this extension. It has a width and height that appear at odds with the proportions of the host building and its neighbour, and these features lead to an excessively high roof line and roof form that would fit awkwardly with the house. The depth of projection of the extension from the house would emphasise these adverse features of the extension.

5. The resultant effect of the proposals would be to harm the appearance of the house and also the character of the area. The garage extensions seen to either side are not comparable precedents for the current scheme, since the scale of those are in proportion to the houses. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy

2011 which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure all new development is of a high quality of design that respects the its local context.

Living conditions

6. The depth and height of the proposed extension, and its proximity to the shared boundary with No. 33, is likely to lead to a harmful reduction in the outlook from windows to that property. This would adversely impact upon the living conditions of those adjoining occupiers. This harmful effect would be contrary to the relevant provisions of Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy that requires new development to not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours.

Conclusions

7. I acknowledge the desire of the appellant to create additional accommodation for the property. However, this must be achieved in a fashion that is not harmful to the character and appearance of the area, nor to the living conditions of existing residents. The proposed development would conflict with the relevant planning policy that seeks to protect such interests and so the appeal is dismissed.

C Leigh

INSPECTOR