The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2012

by David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT

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

Decision date: 24 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/12/2169427
8 Park Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville PO7 5ES

- 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 B Quance against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref APP/11/01740, dated 31 October 2011, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2011.
- The development proposed is a two storey side addition.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of neighbours, particularly in terms of outlook.

Reasons

Living Conditions of Neighbours

3. The side elevation of the proposed extension would be very close to the boundary between the host property and the neighbouring house at 9 Abbots Close. The rear elevation of that adjacent property would be about 5m away from the proposed side elevation. The rear elevation of No 9 includes the kitchen window at ground floor level and I saw that the space between the kitchen and the boundary with the appeal property is used as an outside patio area.

4. Although the proposed design does include a hipped roof (rather than a gable end), the height, depth and proximity of the proposed extension would nevertheless have a significantly harmful and overbearing impact on the neighbour's outlook. The requirement of policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy, which seeks to ensure that development would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours, would not be met.

Other Matters and Conclusion

5. I agree with the statements in the Officer's Report that firstly, any issues regarding loss of privacy could be overcome by the imposition of a condition

requiring obscure glazing to be used in the proposed en suite, and secondly that the appearance of the proposed extension would not have a 'seriously adverse effect' on the street scene. With regard to this last matter I have therefore given little weight to that part of the reason for refusal which refers to the loss of space about the building. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm caused to the living conditions of neighbours through loss of outlook as identified above and for that reason the appeal should be dismissed.

David Hogger

Inspector