



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2019

by Tim Crouch DipUD MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/W/18/3213897

Land adjoining 1a Sutton Road, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 8PU

- 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 Mitchell Barney against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/18/00148, dated 30 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2018.
 - The development proposed is detached dwelling with integral garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on;
 - the character and appearance of the area, and
 - the living conditions of occupiers of 1a Sutton Road with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. There is a mix of architecture within Sutton Road, with clusters of similar dwellings. To the east of the proposed site are detached and semi-detached bungalows, and to the west two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. The height and scale of the bungalows gives the street a spacious character from the east, which continues to the west given the gaps between the taller two storey dwellings.
4. The proposed site lies on the outside of a gentle curve in the street. As a large and unique gap, this gives the site some prominence and marks the subtle transition in character as the buildings become two storey to the west. The current openness of the site contributes to the gaps between built form.
5. The proposed erection of a two storey dwelling, close to the boundaries on either side would significantly infill this characterful gap between buildings. The height and width of the building, in close proximity to the built form on either side, would be conspicuous in the streetscene and harmful to the open character between buildings. Although the two storey element is set back and is motivated by the design of buildings locally, the integral garage and front

door, which would cover much of the frontage given the tapering proposed plot shape, would be positioned in front of the existing building line and exacerbate the visual harm. Whilst there are other single storey front projections in the locality, these are smaller in scale and do not cover such a proportion of the frontage.

6. Due to the size, positioning and width the proposal would therefore appear cramped and incongruous in the streetscene, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) (CS) (2011), the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (2019). Taken together these require development, amongst other objectives, to respond positively to existing features of local character.

Living conditions

7. Whilst set 1 metre into the proposed plot, the proposal would still result in significant height and length of built form close to the boundary with 1a Sutton Road, set 1 metre within its proposed revised plot. The two storey element would be for the majority of the length of No 1a and would be adjacent to its front door, positioned well into the site. This significant built form, close to the front door, would define the access way and produce a tall, overbearing impact of built form. The height, mass and siting would therefore result in an overbearing impact on the outlook of occupiers of No 1a which would lead to unacceptable living conditions.
8. There are two side windows of No 1a facing the proposal. One is obscured and serves a bathroom. The other is a secondary window to the kitchen, which has its primary window to the south. This secondary window is also expressly proposed to be removed by the appellant. Given these relationships, nature of the rooms and the orientation of the buildings, I do not consider that the reduced levels of light as a result of the proposal would have a significant harmful impact on the living conditions of occupiers of No 1a. This does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above however.
9. The proposal would therefore result in harm to the living conditions of occupiers of 1a Sutton Road with particular regard to outlook. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy CS16 CS, the SPD and the Framework insofar as they relate to outlook. Taken together these require development, amongst other objectives, to not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through loss of outlook.

Other Matters

10. The Council's third reason for refusal is in relation to securing provision towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. Both parties have confirmed that this can be secured through contributions should the development otherwise be considered acceptable. However, this matter does not require any further attention given my findings above in relation to the main issues.
11. Whilst not included in the Council's decision notice, concern was raised in the Officer Report in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. Given that I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons I have not considered this matter further.

12. There is dispute between parties as to whether or not the Council has a five year supply of housing land in place. Even if the appellant is correct in his assertion that there is a shortfall, the contribution one dwelling would make to the shortfall would be very limited. This offers little support in favour of the proposal.
13. The appellant has commented on matters that are of concern to interested parties, but as I have found that the appeal fails in relation to the main issues it has not been necessary for me to deal with these other matters.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Tim Crouch

INSPECTOR