APPDECNO

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2010

by M A Champion BSc CEng FICE FIStructE FCIHT FHKIE
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:
10 August 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/10/2131517
3 Sunshine Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 9TF.

- 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 P Balkwill against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application ref: 10/65451/001, dated 18 February 2010, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2010.
- The development proposed is: first floor front addition.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building, the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District-Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 deals with high quality design.

4. The appeal site lies in a residential area on the west side of Sunshine Avenue. It comprises a detached house in a short cul-de-sac of modern dwellings to a variety of similar designs, most incorporating a single gable in the front elevation.

5. The proposal would construct a first floor front extension over the existing integral garage under a gabled roof similar to the existing gable. The new gable would be larger than the existing and would add mass and bulk to the first floor of the building.

6. Although gables are a feature of houses in this area they are generally well spaced along the street frontage of the buildings. The proposal would result in two large adjoining gables of differing size on one dwelling which itself is close to its neighbours on each side. Having regard to the prominence of the site in the street scene, and its visibility from both Sunshine Avenue and Old School Drive, I consider that the proposal would be a massive extension that would unbalance the host property and be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area.

7. I acknowledge that the existing building is set back from its neighbours but, in view of the open character of the area, do not consider this sufficient to reduce the impact on the street scene.

8. The appellant states that he requires the additional bedroom space to accommodate his growing family. While this may be so, personal circumstances are seldom considered material in planning terms as the development would remain long after the need for it has ceased.

9. I conclude, therefore, that the development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the building, the street scene and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy D1.

M A Champion

INSPECTOR