



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2011

by Colin A Thompson DiplArch DipTP RegArch RIBA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 18 January 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/10/2140821

3 Sunshine Avenue, Hayling Island PO11 9TF

- The appeal is under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (the Act) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is by Paul Balkwill against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/10/00558, dated 24/8/2010, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2010.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front addition revised design.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background Information

2. A similar proposal to extend one of the front bedrooms, but to a different elevational design, was refused at appeal on 10 August 2010 (reference App/X1735/D/10/2131517). This is a material consideration which I must take into account.

Main Issue

3. There is one main issue in this case. This is the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the existing house and the street scene.

My Reasoning

4. This part of Sunshine Avenue is a compact cul de sac. The appeal building, and neighbouring houses, are to attractive designs. An important feature of the group, both individually and collectively as seen from the road, is the indented fronts of most buildings. Typically, a two storey gable projects forwards from the rest of the main façade often with a single storey, pitched roof infill, on one side. This asymmetrical indented design of the front of the appeal house, and many of its neighbours, gives attractive modelling. This results in the street scene having a pleasing human scale and traditional domestic character.
5. Although the proposed two storey extension would be slightly set back from the main gable, effectively, a single, double fronted, two storey, block would be created. Not only would the junction of the new hipped, and existing gable, roofs look awkward but also the greater mass of the new ensemble would appear unduly oppressive, and unattractive, destroying the important frontage modelling noted above. This is sufficient reason for withholding planning permission.

6. Additionally, allowing this scheme could set an unfortunate precedent for other two storey frontage extensions hereabouts making it difficult for the Council to refuse similar proposals. Taken together a number of such schemes could have a most damaging cumulative impact on the character and appearance of this residential cul de sac and adds weight to the main reason for refusing the appeal.
7. In summary, this is not a good design which as a result would cause the appeal proposals to conflict with the main thrust of Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District-Wide Local Plan. Because of the unacceptable harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the appeal house and the street scene, with the policy non compliance also in mind, the appeal should be dismissed.
8. In forming this opinion I have taken into account the other matters raised. That design is a subjective consideration does not prevent firm conclusions being reached as to the acceptability of particular proposals. The presence of single storey rear extensions at the property, with hipped pitched roofs, does not mean that such a roof solution would be acceptable for two storey front extensions where gables presently predominate. The proposed use of materials similar to those employed for the existing house, although welcomed, does not make acceptable something which is unacceptable in principle. The presence of some less than satisfactory front extensions, to other houses in the wider locality, is not a good reason to allow another one here.
9. I have considerable sympathy for the needs of the appellant's growing family. But personal circumstances are generally not significant land use planning considerations because such circumstances are likely to change over time whereas planning permissions have a more permanent, longer term, impact and usually go with the land. Subject to extant planning policies, and any impact on neighbours and the surrounding area, it may be possible to add an acceptable two storey bedroom extension to the rear of the house. But this is not a matter before me and would need to be the subject of negotiations with the Council and probably a separate planning application. The support of immediate neighbours for the appeal scheme does not alter my opinion that planning permission should be withheld for the reasons already given. None of these matters is sufficient to alter my conclusion on the main issue.

Colin A Thompson