



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2025

by **Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/24/3356533
126 London Road, Widley PO7 5EW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Anthony Brothers against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/24/00692.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application as “Installation of double car port at front elevation”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached property that faces onto London Road. It is part of a row of dwellings within the immediate vicinity between Park Road and commercial premises to the north that include a car dealer. These residential properties have a fairly strong and clear building line with the space to the front being characterised by a general lack of buildings. Moreover, these attributes can be readily appreciated from the street due to factors such as the often low boundary treatment and limited vegetation. As a result, there is a pleasant sense of openness and consistency to the streetscene.
4. The proposed car port would be located to the front of the host dwelling and relatively close to the street. As a result, it would be an unduly prominent and incongruous feature, unacceptably out of keeping with the pattern of development. It would intrude into the front garden environment and unduly disrupt the building line. This adverse impact would occur regardless of the structure occupying less than a quarter of the area to the front of the dwelling. Furthermore, it would have a footprint of 6 by 5.8 metres and therefore be of significant size despite the flat roof form limiting the height.
5. The Appellant has referred to a number of pitched roof garages at properties in London Road. However, none of these are located within the group referred to above and are not therefore part of the specific context within which the detrimental impact I have described would arise. I also note that the pitched roof garage at 112

faces onto Park Road and although forward of the host dwelling is set back significantly from the street. These cases therefore provide no meaningful support for the appeal.

6. The Appellant indicates that a laurel hedge would be planted to the front with the intention of completely screening the car port. However, it is likely that it would take some time for the new planting to mature sufficiently to provide any meaningful screening effect. Moreover, based on the submitted site plan it is clear that the structure would be readily seen from the street through the drive anyway. In any event, it is likely that the new building would be a significantly longer lasting feature of the locality than any vegetation which may simply die or be removed by future occupiers. Although there are no houses on the other side of London Road, the detrimental impact would be apparent to pedestrians passing in the street.
7. Rather than serving to complement the house, the proposed cladding of the new building would unduly contrast with the render of the host dwelling. In consequence, it would further exacerbate the detrimental effect.
8. In these circumstances the streetscene and character and appearance of the locality would be harmed. There would be conflict with Havant Borough Core Strategy, March 2011, Policy CS16, which, among other things, seeks to ensure that development responds to, draws inspiration from and respects the local context. It also intends that design should be informed by the characteristics of the locality in respect of matters such as existing building lines.
9. The development would also be contrary to the advice in the Havant Borough Council, Borough Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, December 2011, that garages and car ports should not project forward of the building line.
10. In the National Planning Policy Framework it is indicated that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations. These include adding to the overall quality of the area and being sympathetic to local character, which would not be achieved in this case.
11. I acknowledge that there have been no objections to the planning application from neighbours or any other interested party. Nevertheless, this does not confer acceptability on the proposal which I must consider on its own merits.
12. Taking account of all other matters raised and given the harm that would result the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR