
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2023

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/23/3315574

2 Queen Anne's Drive, Havant, Hampshire PO9 3PG

- 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 Mathew Parker against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/22/01085, dated 10 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a "two storey rear extension, alterations to roof including new rooflights and dormers, convert existing carport to living accommodation, new roof with rooflights and dormers to carport, and new glazing to form conservatory. This is a reapplication with amendments to previously approved application APP/22/00752"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. Situated at a prominent intersection of several residential streets, the appeal dwelling is a substantial property set in generous grounds with mature landscaping. To one side of the main part of the appeal dwelling is a single storey structure (which the appellant describes as a "carport") the flank wall of which is contiguous with the boundary wall of the property which faces onto Hulbert Road and its junction with Park Lane. Amongst other elements, as described above, the appeal proposal would see an upwards extension to the carport by means of a new roof, and the inclusion of rooflights and dormers to that new element. An upper floor to the carport would be created within the proposed roof space.
4. The construction of the appeal property apparently took place before most of the dwellings in its surroundings. Nevertheless, like properties in its environs, elements of the appeal property with more than one storey are set back considerably from street-facing elements of the plot. I saw that in the environs of the appeal property, relatively low scale boundary treatments, including walls, close-boarded fences and hedges, were the most noticeable features at the interstice of the public and private realms, with single-storey ancillary

structures present in some cases behind those. The existing carport and its relationship with the boundary are consequently features which are broadly consistent with the character of the appeal property's surroundings in these respects.

5. Consequently, in this context the imposing scale of flank walling that would be introduced along the boundary of the appeal property, and above the existing boundary wall would be a dominant and incongruous feature which would be unsympathetic to the pattern of development in its surroundings. Moreover, the prominent location of the appeal property coupled with the adjacency of the appeal scheme to its boundary, would mean that the additional flank walling and proposed roof treatment would be widely visible and visually jarring features. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene. Moreover, the harmful effect of the appeal scheme's scale and siting in these regards would not be successfully mitigated by the mature landscaping within the appeal property's grounds, or the use of tile cladding in the upper part of the proposed flank wall, or the barn-hipped roof design.
6. In arriving at this view, I have taken into account that some design elements of the appeal scheme are similar to those incorporated in the proposals which have recently received planning permission in relation to the site (Council reference: APP/22/00752) (the approved scheme). Nevertheless, there would be a considerable gap between the upward extension proposed in that approved scheme and the side boundary of the property, and it would thus avoid the harmful effects that would result from the appeal scheme. Accordingly, the extant permission relating to that alternative scheme does not serve to justify the proposals subject to this appeal.
7. The appellant draws attention to the pumping station situated, according to the Council, some 150m away from the appeal property, and has supplied historic mapping which indicates it would have been present when No 2 was initially built. Nevertheless, in contrast to the appeal proposal, rather than presenting an expanse of flank walling lacking in any openings to the street, the pumping station presents what appears to be a principal elevation with a door and window. Moreover, its tight curtilage and functional appearance impart a distinctive character to the pumping station, meaning that it reads clearly and distinctly as an element of the streetscene separate to the grounds and ancillary buildings of the area's residential properties. For these reasons, the presence of the pumping station does not provide a precedent for the proposed development, and neither does it justify its harmful effects.
8. Taking the above considerations together leads me to the view that, due to its scale and siting, the proposed development would fail to respect the established pattern of set-back in the area, and consequently would be out of step with the advice contained in the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted December 2011) (the SPD) (at page 27). This fundamental shortcoming of the proposed development means that its accordance with other aspects of the SPD such as in terms of its proposed materials, its roof form, fenestration and subservience to the original dwelling do not weigh in its favour to any material degree.
9. Accordingly, the reasons set out above lead me to the clear conclusion on this main issue that the appeal scheme would cause material harm to the character

and appearance of the streetscene. For these reasons, the proposed development would conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (adopted March 2011) (the Core Strategy) which amongst other matters expects characteristics of a locality to be used to help inform the design of new development including heights and massing. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (at paragraph 130) insofar as it requires new developments to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

10. Although the appellant points out that the Council has withdrawn a local plan from examination, the Core Strategy remains part of the development plan for the area. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) expects decisions to be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
11. In this case, I have found that the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan in terms of the above-cited policy. Whilst the appellant considers the space that could be created by the approved scheme would be "severely limited", the increase in space over and above this that could result from the appeal scheme attracts only minimal weight in its favour in planning terms. Consequently, neither this matter nor any other material considerations advanced in favour of the appeal scheme are of a sufficient weight to indicate that a decision other than in accordance with the development plan is justified in this case.
12. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR