

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2016

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/16/3148603

High Bank, Morton Road, Brading, Isle of Wight PO36 0EJ

- 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 Steve Tutton against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application, Ref. P/01482/15, dated 30 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear 3 storey extension incorporating 2 bedrooms with an en-suite and a kitchen-living room at ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including regard to its designation as an AONB, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of the the adjoining property Greenfields as regards outlook and light.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, the Council considers that although the proposal would be acceptable in terms of increase in footprint, the size, scale and bulk of the extension would be out of keeping with the existing property and the third storey height of the gable end incongruous in relation to the surrounding dwellings.
 4. I saw on my visit that the existing dwelling is the same house type as the adjoining Greenfields, although the latter has had a conservatory added to the rear elevation. However, there are a variety of roof designs on this side of the road including several properties with rear gable ends. The difference in this case is the third storey element and when read alongside the lower profile of the hipped roof of Greenfields this would be notably different, particularly when the increased depth of the building is taken into account.
 5. However, for the most part this impact would be evident in private views at close quarters and I am not convinced that from the longer views, for example from the public footpath, this difference would necessarily draw the eye and be perceived negatively as an incongruous addition. Thus in this regard I do not consider that there would be unacceptable harm to the AONB, as from the
-

countryside to the rear of the properties the view would remain one of a line of houses of varied shapes and sizes.

6. To an extent this type of judgement in a scheme's visual impact is difficult to make until a development has been completed but although clearly not subordinate, the proposed design and scale are in my view acceptable. My conclusion on this point is supported by the 'before and after' computer graphic illustrations in the grounds of appeal, and I certainly have no doubt that in terms of the views from Morton Road the variety of house types, sizes and designs is such as not to preclude the appeal scheme.
7. On balance on this issue I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area including having regard to its designation as an AONB. There would not therefore be any unacceptable conflict on this issue with Policies SP5, DM2, DM12 of the Island Plan Core Strategy 2012 or with Government policy on design in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 ('the Framework').
8. Turning to the second issue, there is a conservatory on the side of the rear part of Greenfields closest to High Bank. The three storey addition would project 4m from the existing rear wall and would therefore extend beyond the rear elevation of the conservatory.
9. Although there is a boundary fence and a distance of about 3m separating the two properties the extension would be of a bulk and height that would unduly dominate the outlook from the conservatory, especially as the latter has three clear glazed panels on its southern side that faces the boundary with High Bank. The conservatory roof is opaque glazed but is nonetheless important for the receipt of daylight and sunlight. Perhaps more important, the overall ambience of a conservatory derives from the combination of glazed walls and ceiling. Accordingly, I am in no doubt that the effect of the extension would be overbearing to the point of having a significant adverse effect on the living conditions for the occupiers.
10. I am aware that the Council does not include the effect on daylight or sunlight in its refusal, but this is part of the objection from the occupiers of Greenfields and because High Bank lies to the south I consider it a valid point, albeit secondary in impact to the additional perception of undue enclosure. I have taken the appellant's point as to the effect on Greenfields if the appellant were to take advantage of permitted development rights, but I disagree as to the extent of the additional impact that would result from the appeal scheme.
11. On this issue I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions for the occupiers of the the adjoining property Greenfields as regards outlook and light in conflict with item 2 of the Island Plan Policy DM2 and the core planning principles of the Framework. My favourable conclusion for the appellant on the first issue does not outweigh the harm caused.
12. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR