



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2023

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/23/3325340
107 Corbett Road, Waterlooville, PO7 5TF

- 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 Connor Morrison against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/23/00165, dated 15 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

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 locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house in estate style with pleasant proportions and elevations. It has a pitched roof and is located on a corner plot and has an attached flat roofed garage to the side which sits on the side boundary line with the neighbouring two storey home located a pathway distant. The estate has a variety of house types of primarily semi-detached and detached properties which create an established residential character of pleasing suburban appearance. The appeal proposal would replace the garage with a larger two storey structure.
 4. As noted above, this residential estate has a variety of house types. Some of these have very little separation at upper level between them whilst others appear more spaciouly arranged. The appeal property is in the latter category in that the flat roofed garage, whilst on the side boundary, does not give a sense of tight development, on the contrary the 'air space' above it is an appreciable gap and positive relief from built form. The appeal property is one of a row of four of this form and a rhythm and symmetry is established.
 5. The appeal scheme would markedly narrow the gap at upper level to the equivalent of a pathway width up to the eaves. Furthermore, the new two storey element would step forward of the main front elevation of the host
-

property with no sense of subtlety and adding to its visual impact. Looking at the planned extension as a whole there would be an unfortunate over-developed cramped appearance evident at this part of the streetscene and a move to a terracing effect. In sum, this would not be characteristic on this stretch and a negative change in the locality's appearance.

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 lead to a terracing effect. 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 and recognise that the scheme would bring benefits to occupiers. I can see that attention has been given to the use of matching materials and window design. I have carefully considered other developments brought to my attention. However, these differ in form or context; for example No 117's building over a garage is appreciably further away from the nearest dwelling than the appeal proposal. 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