The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2011

by J O Head BSc(Econ) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 September 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2156916
52 Bembridge Drive, Hayling Island, Hampshire PO11 9LU

- 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 Mrs E Cornelius-Jackson against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref APP/11/00352, dated 1 April 2011, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2011.
- The development proposed is a first floor side extension and porch to front.

Decision

1. **The appeal is allowed** and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and porch to front at 52 Bembridge Drive, Hayling Island in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/11/00352, dated 1 April 2011, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) Subject to taking account of the discrepancy noted in paragraph 2 below, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BEM/1 (as amended by east and north elevation drawing dated 5/8/11); BEM/2; BEM/3; BEM/4 (site plan).

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension and porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

****

Procedural matter

2. At the site visit it became evident that there is an error on Drawing No BEM/2 with respect to the relative positions of the appeal property and its neighbour at No 15 Meath Close. No 15 is shown to be set some 2 metres forward of No 52, whereas the true situation on the ground is that the main front and rear walls of the 2 buildings are on approximately the same alignment. The appeal decision is based on the situation that was observed on site.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposed side extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling, No 15 Meath Close, with particular reference to its visual impact.

Reasons

4. The proposal would replace the existing lean-to hipped roof of the single storey side extension, adjacent to No 15 Meath Close, with a full height second storey topped by a double hipped roof with a central valley. The extension would be close to the boundary with No 15, but that property has only a low-level landing window and glazed doors (serving a bedroom) at first floor level facing No 52. The doors give access onto a narrow balcony which runs along the side elevation of No 15 and widens out into a seating area which projects beyond the main south elevation of the house to allow an unobstructed view of the beach and coastline towards the Isle of Wight. That part of the balcony and its view would be unaffected by the appeal proposal as it would lie mainly to the south of the extension.

5. There is no open view towards the west from the narrow part of the balcony at No 15, the aspect being towards the flank wall of the appeal property and the roof of the single-storey extension. By replacing the hipped end of that roof with a vertical wall, the appeal proposal would have a more dominant visual impact than the existing. However, the narrow part of the balcony appears to be used mainly for access rather than for sitting out. Because of the roof design of the proposed extension, the glazed doors and window at No 15 (which are not principal windows) would not suffer any significant loss of light. Views northwards from No 15 would not be affected and are not attractive, being predominantly of a car parking area and garages.

6. Bearing in mind the actual position of the balcony at No 15 in relation to the proposed extension at the appeal property, the visual impact of the extension would not be so overbearing or intrusive as to conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy or with the design advice in Planning Policy Statement 1 *Delivering Sustainable Development*. It would not be sufficient to cause any significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 15 Meath Close.

7. No objection has been raised to the proposed porch. Subject to the conditions in paragraph 1 above, both the porch and the extension are acceptable. The appeal therefore succeeds. As to the conditions, No 1 is the statutory time condition and No 2 is imposed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Condition 3 is in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

John Head

INSPECTOR