
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2015

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/14/2221647

62 Hambledon Road, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 7UB

- 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 Iraque against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/14/00246, dated 3 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2014.
 - The development proposed is '*First floor extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to overshadowing, loss of light and outlook, and also the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal property is a dormer bungalow, similar in style to No 64 on the adjoining plot to the west. No 60, the other immediate neighbour, is a two-storey dwelling, but much narrower in profile, set significantly forward of No 62. Indeed, the vast majority of the appeal dwelling lies behind the rear building line of No 60. The proposed development involves significant external alterations and, primarily, the heightening of the bungalow to effectively create a two-storey dwelling.
 4. The appeal dwelling's flank wall lies close to the common boundary with No 60. The current eaves height of some 2.5m would increase substantially to approximately 4.9m, although the submitted drawings show that the ridge height would increase by only 0.6m. Whilst the single-storey gabled projection to the front of the property would remain, a two-storey flank wall to a depth of some 8.7m would result, the length of which would run the majority of No 60's rear garden.
 5. Given the dwelling's positioning and orientation relative to both neighbouring properties I do not consider that No 64 would be unduly affected by the
-

proposal. However, in contrast, I do consider that the occupiers of No 60 would be significantly impacted upon as a consequence of its rear garden being overshadowed by the considerable expanse of heightened flank wall. The development, involving a substantial increase in the dwelling's bulk, height and massing so close to the common boundary fence, would inevitably lead to a reduction in daylight/sunlight entry to No 60's rear garden. Consequently, I consider that this would have implications for the neighbours' enjoyment of their garden area. The development's extent would also adversely affect the outlook currently enjoyed by the neighbours at No 60. In the circumstances, I therefore consider that the proposal would represent an oppressive and obtrusive form of development which would be to the detriment of No 60's occupiers.

6. On the first main issue I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and this would conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (LP) that requires for high quality design which, amongst other things, would not cause unacceptable harm to neighbours' amenities. It would also run contrary to relevant advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Character and appearance

7. From my site visit I noted that the dwellings accessed off Hambledon Road, although all built post-war, comprise a variety of designs set within curtilages of differing size and shape. Notwithstanding my findings on the first main issue I consider that the appeal dwelling, if heightened as proposed, would not adversely affect the street scene. The dwelling is adequately spaced from the flank elevations of Nos 60 and 64, and the harm I have identified would result in terms of the proximity of its flank wall to the common boundary with No 60 would not be apparent from Hambledon Road itself. I consider that the resulting relationship between the dwellings' frontages, as viewed from the street, would not appear cramped and would remain satisfactory.
8. On the second main issue I thereby conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and I do not consider that the proposal conflicts with the aims and objectives of LP Policy CS16 or advice within the Framework.

Conclusion

9. Although I have found that the proposal would not impact upon the street scene this does not outweigh the harm I have identified that would result from the development to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers. I consider such an impact to be compelling. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR