The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2012

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

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

Decision date: 17 January 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2166011
11 Maylands Road, Havant, PO9 3NP

- 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 Ms Rose Gerlach against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref: APP/11/01151 dated 14 June 2011, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2011.
- The development proposed is two storey side extension & single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on the south-west side of Maylands Road. It currently has a detached garage which adjoins the common boundary with the adjacent property at No 13 Maylands Road. No 13 is also semi-detached and has been extended over two storeys with a hipped roof to the side, leaving a narrow passageway along the common boundary with the appeal property.

4. Maylands Road mainly comprises pairs of semi-detached properties of varying styles. Although some of the properties have been extended over two storeys, including at both No 9 and No 13, there generally remains good sized open gaps, particularly above ground floor level, between the pairs of properties. These open gaps contribute to the appearance of well-spaced properties which is a distinctive characteristic of this local area.

5. The proposed extension, over two floors with a hipped roof, would extend very close to the boundary with No 13. Given the existing two storey extension at No 13 I consider that the proposal would result in a terracing effect, removing most of the existing gap between the two properties. Whilst the existing roof at No 13 is and the proposed at the appeal property would be hipped, I do not consider that this would be sufficient to provide a visual open gap between the

properties. The resultant terracing effect would detract from and therefore harm the more spacious character and appearance of the local area. This would conflict with Policy CS16 of the adopted Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 as well as guidance in Planning Policy Statement 1: *Delivering Sustainable Development*. This policy and guidance, amongst other things, seek for development to be of a high standard and to respond to the local context.

6. I have sympathy with the Appellant's family related and other reasons for seeking to extend her property and to replace the existing garage, but these matters do not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the local area. I also understand the Appellant's concerns that some properties have been able to extend over two storeys almost to the common boundary of their plot, whilst her proposal has now been refused. However, I necessarily have to determine the effect of this proposal on the basis of the position as it now exists.

7. I agree that there are no issues with the design of the proposal by itself, or in relation to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of adjoining neighbours. The Council has also raised no concerns in this regard.

8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR