The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2011

by Sheila Holden BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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

Decision date: 9 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2158440
41 Stansted Crescent, Havant, Hampshire PO9 5NL

- 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 A Haylock against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref APP/11/01081, dated 31 May 2011, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2011.
- The development proposed is a single storey front extension – resubmission of APP/10/780.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed extension firstly, on the character and appearance of the area and secondly, on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 43 in relation to visual intrusion.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Stansted Crescent is characterised by a variety of semi-detached two-storey dwellings. However, No. 41, which is paired with No. 43, is part of a group of identical pairs of semis with pitched roofs, large windows and integral garages. The garage and front doors form extended porches that protrude from the front elevations and have flat roofs. This flat roof element, which occupies about half the width of each of these dwellings, is repeated throughout the group and provides a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity along this section of the street.

4. In this context the proposal to extend the porch forwards and across the whole width of the property would introduce new and incongruous features into the street scene. The additional depth would increase the bulk of the building and detract from the existing simple design. The proposed extension would be highly visible from elsewhere in Stansted Crescent and would be out of keeping with all the other properties in this group, which have not been altered. The hipped ends to the roof on the proposed extension would conflict with the simple pitched roof of the host property as well as being incompatible with the wider street scene.

5. The appellant suggested that a scheme similar in scale to the appeal proposal could be constructed without planning permission. However, no specific details or plans of such a proposal were presented with the evidence. On this basis it would not appear that there is a serious intention to implement such a scheme and I therefore give this matter little weight in my considerations.

6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Core Strategy, adopted 2011, which seeks high quality design that respects its setting. It would also be contrary to the government's objective of promoting good design set out in Planning Policy Statement 1.

Living conditions

7. No. 43 has a large picture window serving its main habitable room which currently looks out over small, open front gardens separated by a shared boundary of low growing shrubs. The proposed extension would protrude 1.6m beyond the existing front elevation. The appellant contends that this would not be harmful as it would not breach the 45 degree rule that is often applied to assess the effect of a proposal on an adjoining property. However, the proposed extension would be immediately adjacent to the window of No. 43. This would result in a loss of outlook and the introduction of a sense of enclosure for the occupiers of this adjoining property. The effects of a front extension, protruding into an otherwise open front garden, cannot be compared with one at the rear where fences and other boundary treatments provide privacy and an extension of greater depth would be acceptable.

8. The Council's Development Control Advice Note No. 7: *Home Extensions – A design guide* (DCAN No. 7) does not provide specific advice about the depth of front extensions but indicates that large or unsympathetic front extensions may not be allowed. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would be an un-neighbourly form of development that would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of No. 43, giving rise to a sense of enclosure and resulting in a material loss of outlook. The proposed extension would be contrary to the aims of the advice set out in DCAN No. 7 and would fail to comply with Policy CS16 of the Havant Core Strategy that seeks to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR