

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/16/3164578

16 St Hilda Avenue, Horndean, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 0JF

- 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 & Mrs Phillip Little against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application, Ref. 56899, dated 10 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension & wood-burner flue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension & wood-burner flue at 16 St Hilda Avenue, Horndean, Waterlooville in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 56899, dated 10 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drawing No. 1949/01 93 Rev. C and the extension shall step back not less than 450mm from the front elevation of the existing building;
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the appearance of the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the street scene of St Hilda Avenue.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that at the far end of St Hilda Avenue there is a considerable unity of design, with pairs of semi-detached dwellings of the same house type and facing brick. As far as I could ascertain, with one exception all the semi-detached pairs have a step down in the ridge to break up the mass, a modest but in my view effective technique. The exception is the appeal dwelling with its neighbour No. 17. As an end pair in the T-shaped cul-de-sac Nos. 16 and 17 are discreetly sited, being to some extent 'tucked away' in the corner of the development as a whole.
-

4. Whilst I acknowledge that in this case the subservience would be modest, relying entirely on a repetition of the existing stepping between the other semi-detached pairs, I am minded to support the materiality of the appellant's reference to the Council's pragmatic view of the similar extension to No. 35 The Spinney, also in Horndean. There are differences to this approved scheme as that dwelling is already part of a terrace, the designs are not comparable and the stepping between houses in that case is much greater. However, in both instances there is a large corner plot and a similar increase in size as a proportion of the host dwelling.
5. In this appeal the similarity of the extension's design, scale and external materials with the host dwelling (as is the case with the approved extension at No. 35 The Spinney) and the introduction of a stepped roof (this being a defining characteristic of this part of St Hilda Avenue albeit exceptionally omitted from this pair of dwellings) will result in a perception that the proposal could have formed part of the original development rather than comprise a disproportionate extension.
6. I acknowledge that there will be a difference to the street scene because of the elongated building, but the absence of stepping between Nos. 16 and 17 already constitutes an element of variation. With its discreet position in the very corner of the development and the extension being for the most part viewed at an angle from a distance which introduces an element of perspective, the change to the rhythm of the St Hilda Avenue street scene would not be unacceptably detrimental.
7. Accordingly, there would be no harmful conflict with Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review 2006; Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy 2014; and Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The proposal is additionally an acceptable exception to the Council's 'Extending Your Home' Supplementary Planning Guidance.
8. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plan is needed for the avoidance of doubt. For the same reason I shall include a reference to the 450mm step back, as together with the consequential reduction in ridge height it is crucial to my Decision. A condition as regards matching external materials is also necessary to ensure that the extension is in keeping with the host dwelling.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR