



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/J1725/D/24/3350646

82 Marine Parade East, Lee-On-The-Solent, PO13 9BJ

- 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 James Ramage against the decision of Gosport Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00195/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey detached garage.
-

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 host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a newly constructed detached house on an acute angle corner plot. Walling runs around this, a situation which, at varying heights, is fairly common locally. The area is of established residential character and the mix of house types, gardens, roads and open spaces all come together to create an area of pleasing appearance.
 4. The proposal is a garage, cycle parking and storage building. It would be about 10 metres in length and run adjacent to the side road front boundary almost into the acute angle alongside Marine Parade East. It would have some 2 metres of vertical walling with a shallow pitch roof over and a ridge height of around 3.4 metres.
 5. To my mind a defining characteristic of this area is some sense of spaciousness and in part this arises from building lines which, whilst not totally regular, do generally result in development being set back from the highway. Boundary walling does not unduly impinge upon the impression. However, I am concerned that the planned building would do just that. Even with a low pitch, which itself would be uncharacteristic, this sizeable building would be patently apparent and appear jarring on the eye. It would look alien in the streetscene and read as a cramped ill-positioned structure. There would be an appearance of inappropriately-forward overdevelopment, garden area would be reduced, and the scheme would be harmful to the aesthetics of the area.
-

6. Policy LP10 of the Gosport Local Plan 2011-2029 is relevant. Amongst other matters, it seeks to ensure that development is of good design and appropriate appearance with suitable layout and scale sympathetic to the character of a site and its surroundings. I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to this policy. It would also conflict with the pertinent aesthetic objectives of the Council's Design Guidance SPD (2014), albeit I recognise that this document could not be expected to cover every eventuality.

Other matters

7. I understand the wish of the Appellant to benefit from some covered storage and I can see that selection of materials has been thoughtful. I note that amenity for neighbours is not an issue. I take the point that this property lacks a traditional 'rear' garden and constraints thus arise. I also appreciate that while the locality has its merits this is not a designated special character area. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but taken individually or together these 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 which I cite mirrors 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 host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR