The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2010

by Stuart M Reid **D Arch (Hons) RIBA**

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

Decision date: 11 January 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/10/2139875
32A Hart Plain Avenue, WATERLOOVILLE, Hampshire PO8 8RX

- 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 George Abraham against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref APP/10/00294, dated 17 June 2010, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2010.
- The development is a proposed first floor extension to the dwelling, a replacement garage and a new greenhouse/store.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect that the development would have on the character and appearance of the surrounding urban area, and on the living conditions of the adjoining residential occupiers, with particular regard to outlook, and overlooking and loss of privacy.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a good-sized 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with a large and pleasant L-shaped garden to its rear. There is a large attached conservatory at the rear. The front garden tapers to a fairly narrow entrance, as the site is located on the outside of a bend in Hart Plain Avenue, and it is set well back in its site. There is a single garage on the hardstanding at the front of the dwelling, and a separate parking area there also. The dwellings either side are fairly close to the appeal building, although they are both set further towards the road than the appeal property.

4. The proposal is to increase the first floor accommodation on the same footprint, with a higher ridge than at present. A larger garage is proposed in a similar location, with a new boundary wall, and a greenhouse and brick store shed are also proposed at the end of the garden.

5. The present chalet bungalow is seen as a building in character and in keeping with the street scene and the area. Its modest scale and traditional materials enable it to be relatively unobtrusive in the locality. By contrast, the proposed first floor extension would be substantial, and would cause the property to unduly dominate the street scene. It would no longer respect local

distinctiveness. Due to the building already filling much of the site width, the substantial increase in height and bulk would cause the loss of important openness between the existing properties, particularly at roof level. The larger garage and the solid brick wall, and the garden building, would add to these concerns, particularly in terms of loss of spaciousness and views through to the rear.

6. From the adjoining properties, the proposal would be excessively bulky and dominant, and would unacceptably harm the outlook from both properties. The bungalow would change from a simple, mainly single storey dwelling, with rooms in a modest pitched roof, to a substantial 2 storey house, with very long flank walls to the adjoining properties at first floor level, and a long and high pitched roof above. This bulk would be very harmful to the occupiers of these properties in terms of damage to their outlook, and the overpowering and oppressive presence of the proposed development close to their boundaries.

7. I agree that the potential for overlooking could be dealt with by conditions to require the use of obscured glazing in the side windows, but this does not outweigh the harm that the substantial bulk of the additional storey and higher roof would have on the adjoining properties. Although concerns have been raised about the potential for overlooking from the proposed first floor bay window at the front, the design is little different to many typical residential streets, and would not be harmful.

8. I similarly conclude that the proposed larger brick garage and attached lengthy brick wall, close to the adjoining garden, and the proposed brick and glass garden building, in an area of generally mature, attractive and spacious gardens, would have a harmful effect, due to their size, on the open and generally verdant character of the area.

9. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the local area and the street scene, and would harm the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers with regard to their outlook, although the use of obscured glazing would deal with issues of overlooking and privacy. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy Policy D1 in the *Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan*.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart M Reid

INSPECTOR