



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2011

by Sheila Holden BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

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

Decision date: 9 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2158488

1a Treloar Road, Hayling Island, Portsmouth, Hampshire PO11 9SE

- 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 P Christie against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/11/0336, dated 29 March 2011, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2011.
 - The development proposed is single storey side addition amended.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed extension on:
 - a) the living conditions of the occupier of No. 16 Bosmere Road in relation to visual intrusion and loss of outlook;
 - b) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. There are just three properties that abut this part of Treloar Road; No. 1a is sited between No. 1 and No. 16 Bosmere Road. No. 1a has a shallow plot and no rear garden. No. 1a is significantly taller than No. 16 due to the fact that the Environment Agency has required the floor levels to be raised by 1.5m in the interests of reducing flood risk. It has a garage and parking space to the east and an amenity space to the west of the dwelling. No. 16 has a shallow rear garden that looks towards this amenity space.

Living conditions

4. The proposal is for an extension that would comprise two elements, both of which would project towards the rear boundary of No. 16. The larger of the two would reduce the separation of the two buildings by about 5.5m leaving approximately 11.5m between them. The main habitable rooms of No. 16 would look directly towards the blank brick wall of the larger element of the proposed extension, which would be about 6m tall. I consider this would appear oppressive from No. 16. The window in the smaller element of the proposed extension would not give rise to overlooking. However, the combined effect of the reduction in separation distance with the otherwise blank façade
-

would appear intrusive. In my view the overall bulk, mass and height of the proposed extension would appear overbearing and visually intrusive from No. 16, adversely affecting the outlook from this property.

5. I conclude that this loss of outlook would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of No. 16, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Core Strategy, adopted in 2011, that seeks to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Character and appearance

6. The two elements of the proposed extension would each have a hipped end to their roofs and the ridges would be below that of the host dwelling. The extension would therefore appear subservient and could be effectively integrated with the existing bungalow. The introduction of elements that would be less tall than the existing dwelling would reduce the contrast between this building and its neighbours, although the additional brick elevations required to raise the floor level would increase its overall bulk. The proposed extension would result in the loss of some space between the buildings in this part of Treloar Road. However, it would still be possible to see between the properties and as those on the south side of Treloar Road are spaced more closely together it would not appear cramped or out of place in this context.
7. I conclude that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and in this respect would comply with Policy CS16 of the Havant Core Strategy.

Conclusions

8. I acknowledge that the appellant wishes to enlarge his home so that he does not have to move and I have found that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. However, its design and proximity to No.16 would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupants of this adjoining bungalow and for this reason, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR