



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2010

by Richard J Maile BSc FRICS

**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:
4 August 2010**

Appeal ref: APP/X1735/D/10/2131317

4 Lisle Way, Emsworth, Hampshire, PO10 7XN.

- 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 Michael Boxall against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application ref: APP/10/00033, dated 9 April 2010, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2010.
- The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. From my inspection of the appeal site and surrounding area and consideration of the representations, I am of the opinion that the principal issues in this case are:
 - a) The impact of the extension upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 - b) The effect of the development upon the living conditions of residents of 5 Lisle Way.

Reasons

- a) *Impact upon character and appearance.*
3. The property comprises a modern detached house which is located adjacent to the turning head of Lisle Way, a development of similar detached houses. The adjacent house (no. 5) is set at rightangles to the subject property. No. 5 has a larger than average rear garden, part of which is located to the south of the proposed two storey extension.
 4. Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 is a "saved" policy. It requires, amongst other matters, that new development is to a high quality design which creates an attractive environment, that has its own distinctive identity but which respects and enhances local character.
 5. The gap that exists between 4 and 5 Lisle Way is an important feature in the street scene as viewed from both Lisle Way and Cotton Drive. It also allows

views of a mature ash tree within the grass verge of Cotton Drive. Development as proposed would infill much of this gap as seen from the turning head of Lisle Way.

6. The houses on this extensive estate and within Lisle Way itself are closely spaced. The gap between nos. 4 and 5 provides a welcome break, which I consider should be protected. The extension would fail to respect this feature, contrary to Policy D1 of the Local Plan.
7. The appellant has provided photographs of other two storey extensions in the locality. However, I am not aware of the planning background to those extensions, which do not appear to have the same adverse impact upon the character and appearance of their surroundings as would arise from the scheme before me.

b) Effect upon living conditions of residents of 5 Lisle Way.

8. The extension would be visible as seen from the front bedroom window of 5 Lisle Way, which is set at rightangles to it and sited in close proximity to its front elevation. It is also likely that the extension would have an overbearing effect as viewed from the neighbour's garden.
9. For these reasons I consider that the proposal would adversely impact upon the living conditions of existing and future residents of 5 Lisle Way, contrary to the objectives of Policy D1 (iv) of the Local Plan.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR