

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/21/3281205
55 Hillmead Gardens, Havant PO9 3NN

- 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 Williams against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. APP/21/00365, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is for creation of carport and first floor side extension, dormer to rear elevation, extension to existing roof including 3no. Velux rooflights to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a residential street predominantly comprising two storey semi-detached and terraced houses. The majority of these have been altered in some way since originally built, however on the whole one characteristic in the road is the spacing between many of the semi-detached dwellings and their respective side boundaries.
4. I acknowledge that the first floor element of the scheme has been reduced in width from the previous appeal scheme¹, nonetheless the proposed carport would be built right up to the boundary with 54 Hillmead Gardens giving the first floor element the appearance of it essentially floating in mid-air over it for approximately two thirds of its width.
5. Notwithstanding the close proximity of some properties to side boundaries elsewhere within the street and the other examples cited by the appellant, I accept that the Council's reference to their Design SPD with regard to the width of plots and proposed buildings falls within the section on 'Residential Backland and Infill Developments'. Nonetheless with respect to extensions and additions to existing residential properties, paragraph 5.38 as set out therein stipulates

¹ APP/X1735/D/20/3263863

that it is important that gaps are retained between buildings which helps to form the pattern of development in an area, which in turn influences local character. Therefore side extensions which have a negative effect on their gap between buildings should be resisted which is particularly important for two storey extensions; and in general such extensions should not be closer than 2m from the boundary with neighbouring properties, which would not be the case here.

6. Consequently, although I accept that the gap between the host dwelling and its immediate neighbour to the south would not be eroded as much as for the previous scheme, nonetheless it would still erode the spaciousness between the two and run counter to the general prevailing pattern of development within the locality.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would give rise to an erosion of the spacing between 55 and 54 Hillmead Gardens leading to an incongruous form of development that would detract from the existing pattern of development within the area of the street that the appeal finds itself situated. I consider the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed places, in addition to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) which requires developments to be designed to a high standard which responds to, draws inspiration and respects local context and, amongst other things, uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of new development.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR