



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/20/3248617

42 St Johns Avenue, Waterlooville, Hants PO7 5QU

- 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 Reginald Cormack against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/19/00932, dated 28 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2019
 - The development proposed is side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - a) the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 44 St Johns Avenue, with particular reference to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 42 St Johns Avenue is a detached chalet bungalow set within a row of bungalows in an established residential area. The property has a flat roof addition at the rear and a freestanding single garage which sits behind the back wall of the dwelling, adjacent to the boundary with 44 St Johns Avenue. The proposal is to replace the garage with a single-storey, flat roof extension on a similar footprint, but bridging the gap to connect with the dwelling and wrapping around the side of the existing single-storey element.
4. Relevant advice on extensions and additions to existing residential properties is set out in the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD). This document forms part of the Council's Local Development Framework and was subject to public consultation during its preparation. I have attached the document significant weight as a material consideration.

5. The SPD states at paragraph 5.39 that single-storey extensions should be more modest in scale than the main building and should not be allowed to dominate. In general, flat roofs are not acceptable. The guidance further stipulates that rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building. Rear extensions should be a maximum of 3 m from the rear wall of the existing house although exceptions to this may be considered, providing there is no adverse effect on neighbouring properties.
6. The proposed development would extend to within 3 m of the rear boundary and it would project beyond the rear wall of the existing flat roof element (itself an extension) by 7 m. Unlike the existing garage, which reads as a separate ancillary outbuilding, the structure would be physically attached to the dwelling. Although not prominent from the street, it would be visible from surrounding properties as a sizeable and disproportionate addition. The development would project discordantly into the garden as an awkward adjunct, its form and massing bearing little relation to the host building.
7. Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) (HBCS) requires that development be designed to a high standard, drawing inspiration from and respecting local context. The extension would not be subservient to the host property, and its design would conflict with the guidance set out in the SPD. The proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area and it would not comply with the development plan or the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as both promote high quality design.

Living conditions

8. The dwellings in this part of St Johns Avenue are built on a slope, with the appeal property set lower than No 44. The proposed extension would be taller than the garage it is replacing, but not significantly so. The difference in ground levels means that the structure would protrude above the boundary fence by approximately half a metre. The Council is concerned that this would be overbearing for the neighbours. However, the extension would be set further off the boundary than the existing garage and this would help to offset the modest increase in height and mass.
9. The development would appear incongruous due to its excessive depth, but it would not be overbearing, or have an adverse impact upon levels of daylight or sunlight entering the neighbours' living accommodation. The change in outlook would be little different in impact terms to the erection of a 1.8 m fence on the boundary, something which is commonplace in most residential settings. There would be no conflict with HBCS Policy CS16, insofar as it seeks to ensure that development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupants of 44 St Johns Avenue. However, its design and scale would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the area. For this reason, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR