The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2011

by David Harmston FRICS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 April 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2148208
26 Mill Road, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO7 7AR

- 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 Gary Murray against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application (Ref APP/10/00944), dated 24 November 2010, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2011.
- The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the area and its impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling – No 24 Mill Road.

Reasons

3. No 26 Mill Road is a semi-detached, two-storey dwellinghouse with living accommodation in the roofspace and a dormer at second floor level in its rear elevation. The property has also been extended to the rear with a single storey addition under a sloping roof. Several of the surrounding dwellings have been altered and enlarged in a similar way. It is proposed to extend the building further at the rear by erecting a first floor extension above the majority of the existing ground floor extension. The extension would protrude by 3.0-metres from the line of the original rear elevation of the dwelling and would incorporate a partially hipped roof. It would be 5.2-metres wide and would extend across the full width of the building.

4. At my site visit I noted the presence of other roof alterations and extensions carried out to houses near to the site, including some where rear dormers have been constructed at second floor level. In the case of the appeal development, the extended roof at first floor level would be visually incongruous in the context of the immediate neighbourhood and would introduce an additional, substantial bulk of building mass into an elevated position that would be readily visibly from a number of the surrounding properties. The design of the development is unsympathetic to the existing building. This is largely due to the piecemeal and uncoordinated arrangement of the various alterations that have been undertaken and which are proposed

now. The development would therefore fail to respect the character and appearance of the area in an adequate way, in conflict with Saved Policy D1(i) of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan (1996 – 2011).

5. On the second main issue, No 24 Mill Road has a single-storey extension at its rear of similar proportions to that existing at the appeal premises. This structure has a partially glazed roof and lies to the north-west of the appeal site. The proposed first floor extension would immediately abut the boundary between the two dwellings and, with its height and depth in the proposed position, the development would result in a material loss of light both to the extension and a first floor bedroom window at No 24 Mill Road. The extension would appear dominant and overpowering from the rear of the neighbouring house to an unacceptable degree, in my view. As such the proposal would fail to comply with the terms of Saved Policy D1(iv) of the Local Plan.

6. I have taken into account everything that has been raised in support of this appeal including the fact that the proposal has been amended in various ways since the refusal of an earlier submission. Nevertheless, the proposals are unacceptable for the reasons I have given and nothing that I have seen or read is of sufficient weight to alter my conclusions above and the reasons for them.

David Harmston

Inspector