

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/22/3305373
15 Havant Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0PT

- 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 D Thornton against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/22/00423, dated 28 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a sectional concrete garage on the driveway to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a good-sized rectangular plot fronting a busy main road. This stretch has a range of property types and includes variation in building lines of principal properties and the nature of frontages. The host property has two points of access, with substantial hedging in between and spacious hardstanding beyond; a garage lies to the rear side. A public house with car park is opposite the appeal site. The appeal proposal is as described above.
 4. I mention above that this part of the road has a variation in building line but most relevantly the scheme would sit well forward of the dwellings to either side and, indeed, to virtually all if not every structure on this stretch. This would not be characteristic of the area. The design of the scheme, and the materials planned, are mundane in my opinion. This sizeable garage would not add positively to the streetscene, quite the opposite. While the Appellant makes a strong play relating to the screening which would derive from existing and planned planting the garage would still be visible in part. In any event I am not convinced that landscape should be a solution to allowing inappropriately sited or designed buildings. With or without landscape, buildings, particularly along a road frontage, should be suitably located and architecturally related to a host property and its surrounds. The stretch of road
-

is of an established nature and reasonable appearance where protection is valid and enhancement would be ideal.

5. While I do appreciate the wish to protect cars, regrettably, in summary, the siting, size and built form of the proposal would be alien and run contrary to the character of the host property and the area.
6. Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure that new development embodies high quality design, reflects local character, and integrates positionally and in other respects with the prevailing scene. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with this policy. CS16 has objectives that are reflected in the Borough Design Guide 2011 which also specifically cautions against frontage garages. In my opinion the scheme would run contrary to its main aesthetic aims albeit this publication cannot be expected to cover every eventuality.

Other matters

7. I have considered the examples of front garden garages drawn to my attention. However, I do not know the planning background to all these; location, garage design, nature of host property, the stretch of road and siting are different; I am not persuaded that these set a precedent or a principle transferable to the appeal scheme; and in any event, I must assess the present case on its own merits. I appreciate that the Appellant offers some alteration to the detailed form, for example the fascia colour, but this would have little effect on a design which is utilitarian. I note that neighbours have not raised objection but I must have regard to the overall picture of the streetscene. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policy and Design Guide which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR