



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/24/3336723

32 Castlemans Lane, Hayling Island, Hampshire, PO11 0PZ

- 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 Mrs Helen Patrick against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/23/00448, dated 22 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as '*First Floor Front extension over the Garage to include a new extended Porch and some internal changes*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of 32 Castlemans Lane and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. Castlemans Lane is a narrow carriageway with no pavements and runs in a straight line north to south with residential properties to the east side and open land to the west. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with an attached flat-roof porch to the front which is linked to a garage positioned towards the building's outside edge, and which projects further forward and marginally to the side of the dwelling's side elevation. The proposal would include extending the porch forward to square the footprint of the front projection to align with the front face of the existing garage and building over at first-floor level to create a new master-bedroom with en-suite.
4. I agree with the appellant that properties along Castlemans Lane vary in design and appearance, with no consistent approach. Nevertheless, I observed during my visit a degree of consistency to the dwellings' building line. Despite obvious alterations to many, including single-storey extensions at some to the front, I saw there to be a fairly uniform alignment to the development pattern at first-floor level, with a relatively consistent minimum set-back from the roadside. This was evident in views along Castlemans Lane in spite of an echelon arrangement for the three semi-detached pairs at Nos 24 – 34 (even). Although the proposed extension would be over 11m from the plot's front boundary, by projecting over 4m beyond the front wall of the original dwelling, the first-floor extension would noticeably break the established pattern of the

street scene. In this regard there would be conflict with the guidance for front extensions as contained within the *Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document December 2011* (SPD).

5. The intrusive nature of the proposal would be exaggerated by its failure to respect the form and proportions of the original dwelling. The front facing eaves on the extension would sit taller than those on the existing roof, and the symmetry of a front facing gabled feature shared with the attached neighbour at No 34 would be broken by an interruption to the existing roof's verge and further unbalanced through the introduction of a new adjoining hipped roof that would be ill-matched. Fenestration patterns and materials would further conflict between the old and new, with the addition overall appearing as a dominant and inharmonious protrusion. This demonstrates further conflict with the SPD.
6. The appellant has pointed to the dwelling's current poor state of repair but improvements to its condition are not dependant upon an extension of the kind proposed. I do not consider the existing garage, at single-storey, to be visually unsympathetic to a degree that would justify the appeal proposal. Neither does the appellant's need for additional space, which is noted.
7. Overall, for the reasons given, by virtue of its size, siting, form, and appearance, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of 32 Castlemans Lane and to the wider character and appearance of the area. By failing to display a standard of design that respects and responds positively to the local context of the area, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011. For the same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed and beautiful places.

Other Matters

8. I have noted the concerns of neighbours regarding the potential impact upon their outlook and light. Due to the separation distances involved, and orientation of neighbouring properties with outlooks from principal living spaces to the front and rear, I agree with the Council's findings that there would be no impact upon the neighbours' living conditions that would be harmful. I also agree that there would be no potential to overlook neighbouring properties to a degree that would impact existing levels of privacy.
9. I note the Council's ecologist was satisfied that there was little likelihood of any protected species being affected by the proposed works.

Conclusion

10. Due to the harm that I have identified and conflict with both the development plan and national planning policy, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR