

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/22/3304382
501 Dunsbury Way, Havant, PO9 5BE

- 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 Matthew Jennings against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/22/00138, dated 9 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension (replacing existing single storey side extension), to provide an annex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application or appeal forms.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached property in traditional estate style with pleasant proportions and elevations. It is located on a corner plot and has existing side and rear single storey extensions. It faces a sizeable public house on the opposing corner which is set back and at an angle to the roads. Excepting this the locality is one of homes of broadly similar form which come together to present an established neighbourhood with residential character and because of garden sizes and building arrangement an agreeable, relatively spacious, appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 5. The general air of spaciousness is a particular feature at most corners on this section of the estate and whilst the existing single storey extension runs up close the footway the fact that it is only at ground level does not impinge upon the relative openness. The planned two storey scheme with an upper level long high flank wall so close to the return side boundary, and with an arrangement of roof changes, would present a very different scene. Both in the immediate and wider scene the appearance would be one of over-
-

development and cramped, awkward, design, all on a plot which is prominent in street views. The enlarged building would look unduly alien and would markedly intrude upon the current pleasing sense of spaciousness.

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 extensions which would be overly prominent in the streetscene. 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 understand the wish to extend this dwelling recognise that the scheme would bring benefits to less fortunate people in need of accommodation. I can see that attention has been given to the use of matching materials and window design and some revisions did take place to try and meet the Council's wishes. I note that no objections were lodged by neighbours. I have carefully considered other developments brought to my attention. This includes 210 Dunsbury Way but this differs from not being so close the footway. Furthermore, other buildings, decking and extensions highlighted are also not directly comparable to the appeal scheme in my opinion. In any event, I must determine the case before me on its own merits. Regrettably, having carefully considered these and all points raised by the Appellant I conclude that the 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 locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR