
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/17/3168261
142 Gunville Road, Carisbrooke PO30 5LP

- 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 Tombleson against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref P/00819/16, dated 10 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a proposed house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area. The second is the effect of the proposal upon living conditions of the neighbouring dwelling at No 146 with particular reference to light. The third main issue is whether, taking account of local housing needs, any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits (the planning balance).

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is within a residential area and the existing dwelling at No 142 is semi-detached. The area contains a range of buildings styles and also sizes with detached, semi-detached and also terraced dwellings. There is a substantial degree of symmetry between the existing dwelling and the dwelling that adjoins it. Both have side additions that are subservient to the original buildings and which do not impose upon the street-scene. There is little uniformity to the architecture in the area but this pair of dwellings has a simple pleasing traditional appearance as do some other pockets of similar dwellings.
4. The proposal would involve a further dwelling added to the northern side of the existing dwelling. Together with the existing side addition, this would extend substantially across the existing gap to the side. This would create a terrace of 3 dwellings. The ridge of the roof would be lower than that of the original dwelling but at the same height as the existing side addition. The terrace would become elongated, looking unbalanced alongside the existing pair of dwellings and would not appear subordinate to those buildings. The unbalancing of the buildings would be emphasised with the addition of a large

2-storey gable at the front which although similar to design features on buildings further to the north, would be in contrast to the more simple elevations of the dwellings that it would be joined to. This would not compliment the character of the adjoining buildings or therefore the surrounding area.

5. The proposed design would be of a much simpler than the scheme previously submitted and dismissed on appeal¹. However, the proposal would still be an incongruous addition to the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
6. In relation to this main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. This would not be a high quality design and would not protect, conserve or enhance the existing environment thereby not complying with Policy DM2 of the Island Plan² (IP) or with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).

Living conditions

7. The proposal would extend towards the northern boundary of the property where it adjoins No 146. That dwelling is in a skewed position, at an angle to the mutual boundary with a constrained area of garden between the building and the boundary fence. It is also lower down the hillside than the appeal site. Although there are other areas of private amenity space, that neighbouring dwelling has a secluded area of garden at the rear of that conservatory alongside the boundary with the appeal site.
8. A gap would be retained along the northern boundary within the appeal site. This along with the hipped roof on that side of the proposed dwelling may help to limit the loss of general daylight due to the position of the proposed dwelling. However, being to the south-west of the adjoining dwelling, it seems likely that there would be some overshadowing of the garden area and the roof of the conservatory due to the proposed dwelling blocking sun-light. These effects may be less than with the previous proposal due to the slight reduction in proposed roof height and the inclusion of the hipped roof. However, I am concerned that the 2 storey dwelling close to the boundary could reduce the enjoyment of part of the neighbouring garden area. The impacts would be different at different times of the year but the conservatory provides a covered space to enjoy the sunshine in all seasons. Based upon the evidence available I consider that these impacts would be harmful.
9. In relation to the second main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon living conditions of the neighbouring dwelling at No 146 due to the overshadowing impact. This would not satisfactorily respond to the constraint provided by the adjoining building. The proposal would not comply with IP Policy DM2 or the requirement of paragraph 17 of the Framework to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of buildings.

Planning balance

10. The appellant is of the view that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing sites and refers to a previous appeal for a site in Arreton that where the Inspector shared concerns about deliverability of

¹ APP/P2114/W/15/3134392

² Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including waste and minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document, adopted March 2012

housing³. If such circumstances exist, policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date although that appeal case is not very up to date. The Council's response does not directly contradict the appellant's view with any evidence however. A new dwelling would provide a beneficial contribution to the supply of housing in such circumstances. This is an accessible location where housing is acceptable in relation to IP Policies SP1 and SP2. I give a moderate degree of weight to these limited benefits of the proposal.

11. The Council has stated that the proposal would require a financial contribution towards habitat mitigation due to the location of the site within the Solent Special Protection Area buffer zone as the proposal would result in a net increase in population. They say that a financial contribution of £172 would be required. The appellant on the appeal form has indicated that a planning obligation would be submitted but this has not occurred. I have a limited amount of evidence about this with respect to the tests for planning obligations within the Framework and the Community Infrastructure Regulations but the matter is not disputed. I will give the lack of a mechanism within this appeal to overcome this concern limited weight against the proposal. This is added to the much more substantial weight against the proposal due to my conclusions on the main issues including the conflict with IP Policy DM2 and the Framework.
12. Even if I were to conclude there is a shortfall in 5 year supply of the scale suggested by the appellant and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefit of a single dwelling. The proposal would not be a sustainable form of development in the terms set out within the Framework.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

³ APP/P2114/A/14/2219750