



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/24/3353111
205 Havant Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0LG

- 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 K Leaves against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/24/00175.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to garage for recreational and personal use (gym, steam room, WC and bar).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to garage for recreational and personal use (gym, steam room, WC and bar) at 205 Havant Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/24/00175, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1332 – E.01.01 & P.01.02.
2. The extensions and works hereby permitted shall be used solely for purposes incidental to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling and the outbuilding shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation.

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 site embodies a chalet bungalow fronting Havant Road with a large almost rectangular garden to the rear. It is towards the edge of a defined built-up area which has established residential character and a unremarkable suburban appearance. Open fields, beyond a driveway, lie to the north while the appeal property's other three sides abut dwellings. The appeal proposal is described above and would be a sizeable structure with a low-pitched hipped roof.
 4. The Council is, in paraphrase, concerned that the proposal is over-large relative to the host dwelling and also that given its proximity to open fields would
-

visually impinge and be out of place. Furthermore, it is put that it would not reflect local patterns of development and would thus be contrary to contextual character.

5. Certainly, by any measure the footprint of the planned building would be large but, primarily because of its limited height and openness on two sides, I am not convinced it would look uncomfortable in relation to the host dwelling. I would say the structure would display some sense of subservience.
6. There is presently a firm visual and actual line between development and open fields and the scheme would not change this. There are no important or proximate views from the countryside towards this part of the built-up area. Even if there were such views, the low structure, with a two-storey house virtually alongside and other built form around, would blend innocuously into the general scene.
7. The pattern of development in the most immediate cluster of housing is a varied one. The main rear building line varies markedly and a range of outbuildings is dotted about the locality. I would therefore not read the appeal proposal as being out of context.
8. Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure that new development embodies good 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 not be conflict with this policy.

Conditions

9. Along with standard commencement the Council suggests a condition requiring development to be in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I would agree with this for the avoidance of doubt. I see no need for an external materials related condition as these are clearly specified within the application. In the interests of visual and residential amenity I agree that future use of the outbuilding should be controlled in accord with the Council's suggestion.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR