

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2016

by Andrew Steen BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16th March 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/15/3133661

33 Alameda Road, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO7 5HD

- 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 Miss Samantha Smith against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/15/00499, received by Havant Borough Council on 1 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2015.
 - The development proposed is build up of the rear gable, insertion of velux windows and dormer to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for building up of the rear gable, insertion of velux windows and dormer to front at 33 Alameda Road, Waterlooville PO7 5HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/15/00499, received by Havant Borough Council on 1 May 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site plan, existing plans and drawing number 14/351/01 stamped received by Havant Borough Council on 1 May 2015.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no windows shall be constructed at first floor level in the west elevation.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that permission was obtained from the original applicant for the appeal to proceed in the name of the appellant.
-

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:

- the effect of the proposed rear roof extension on the character and appearance of the area; and
- the effect of the proposed rear roof extension, including velux windows to the sides, on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The proposed development would include a rear extension to the roof of this bungalow to enable the conversion of the roof space above it to living accommodation. The rear part of the dwelling forms a previous extension and it is intended to replace the rear hipped roof with a half hip with blank end to provide additional accommodation within the roof space.
5. The additional bulk and mass of the proposed new extension would be to the rear of the building and would only be visible in limited views from Alameda Road. The height of the extension would remain the same as that of the existing house. Whilst the resulting bulk and mass of the extension combined with existing extensions would be large, the proposed extension is only a relatively small part of that and the location to the rear of the building ensures that the proposed extension would be subservient to the main house.
6. The blank rear wall would not be visible from the front of the property, but may be glimpsed in views through boundary planting from Greenacre Gardens. Given the lack of prominence in these views, the limited effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable.
7. I note that the Council suggest the proposed development is unlike anything else nearby, but the appellant suggests that there are other similar extensions in the vicinity. As the extension would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area, the existence of otherwise of similar extensions is not decisive.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed rear roof extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (CS), Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that require development to respect the context of the site and reflect the characteristics of the area.

Living conditions

9. A number of roof lights are proposed to allow light into the first floor of the extension. Those serving bathrooms and stairwells to the centre of the roof would not overlook neighbouring properties such that they would not have an adverse effect on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

10. Further to the rear are additional roof lights that would serve the rear bedroom. These would be in the roof slope such that they would allow light into the rooms, but it would not be easy to see out of them toward neighbouring gardens. In addition, between those windows and rear gardens on Alameda Road are pairs of flat roofed garages that would largely block any limited overlooking of those rear gardens. Rear gardens and houses on Greenacre Gardens are located at an oblique angle from those windows, such that views toward those properties would be difficult to achieve.
11. I agree with the Council that obscure glazing is not appropriate for bedroom windows, but given my findings above I do not consider it necessary. The Council refer to a perception of overlooking, but I do not consider this likely in this instance given the angle of the windows to neighbouring dwellings and with the garages separating them.
12. For the above reasons, the proposed rear roof extension, including velux windows to the sides, would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to their privacy. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policy CS16 of the CS, the SPD and the Framework that require development to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other matters

13. The Council have accepted that the front dormer window would be acceptable in terms of design and effect on occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. I agree with their findings in this respect.

Conditions

14. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition is required for materials to match those used on the existing house to maintain the character and appearance of the area. A condition is required restricting provision of additional windows at first floor on the west elevation to protect occupiers of neighbouring dwellings at 7 and 8 Greenacre Gardens from overlooking and loss of privacy.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons and taking into account all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Andrew Steen

INSPECTOR