
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/17/3174388

Mead View, 22 Church Road, Shanklin PO37 6QY

- 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 Mark and Sarah Pittard against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref P/00221/17, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as '2 bed dormer flat'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal as originally submitted was accompanied by drawing 1071/02 Revision B, as opposed to Revision C, with Revision C being the drawing considered by the Council. At my request drawing 1071/02 Revision C has been submitted and I have only had regard to it in determining this appeal.
3. While the name/address of the appeal property has been queried by a third party that name has been used by both the appellant and the Council on the application form and the decision notice. I therefore consider it appropriate to use that address in the banner heading above. For ease of reference I shall refer to the site as No 22 hereafter.
4. Reference has been made to No 22 adjoining the Shanklin Conservation Area (the CA). To assist my understanding of the site's relationship with the CA the Council, at my request, has submitted a map showing the CA's extent.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the development on: the living conditions for its occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and light; and the character and appearance of No 22 and the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

6. The development would involve alterations to the roof at the western end of No 22 (the roof extension), enabling a two bedroom flat to be provided. The roof extension would be pitched to the front, while much of its rear half would

take the form of a flat roofed dormer. No 22 is a substantial two storey property that has been converted into flats.

7. The dormer would have three windows in its rear elevation and those windows would variously serve the bedrooms and an open plan lounge/kitchen. The lounge/kitchen would also be served by a new front facing window in an existing gable and four small rooflights. The windows in the dormer would all face towards an external roof level space that would be enclosed on three sides by the slopes of other parts of No 22's roof. The outlook from each of the bedrooms would therefore be virtually non-existent and it would appear likely that the proximity of the other adjoining roof slopes would affect the receipt of light to the bedrooms. I therefore consider that the bedrooms would provide oppressive living conditions for the flat's occupiers.
8. Potentially the outlook from the lounge/kitchen would be more extensive because that area would have a vertically hung window to the front, and this part of the flat would not rely solely on a rear window. However, because the front window would be in the gable end it would be in a corner of the lounge/kitchen, and thus provide limited outlook for much of this part of the flat's living space. The rooflights would afford glimpses of the sky and would therefore provide limited outlook. The lounge/kitchen would also potentially provide quite a gloomy environment. That is because the receipt of natural light via the rear window could be affected by the proximity of the other elements of No 22's roof, while its other windows, would for the most part, be north facing.
9. Reference has been made to a roof terrace being provided for the occupiers of the flat. However, that space would be very small and enclosed, given the proximity of the other parts of No 22's roof. I am therefore not persuaded that the availability of a roof terrace would address the inadequacy of the flat's internal living space that I have identified.
10. I therefore conclude that the development would provide unacceptable living conditions for its occupiers. There would therefore be conflict with paragraph 17 (the fourth planning principle) because the development would not secure a good standard of amenity (living conditions) for its occupants.

Character and Appearance

11. No 22 is generally of a pleasant appearance that is compatible with its surroundings. However, the flat roof at the western end of the building has a poor appearance and is unrepresentative of the area, where pitched roofs are the norm. I consider the existing flat roof, given its position and uniqueness of form, makes a negative contribution to the streetscene and its replacement would enhance No 22's and the streetscene's appearance. I recognise that the Inspector who determined the recent appeal¹ for a house to the rear of No 22 reached a different finding with respect to the appearance of the flat roof. However, the previous appeal concerned an entirely different development and the flat roof's presence was peripheral to that appeal's determination, unlike for the appeal before me.
12. I consider that the roof extension would not encroach significantly into the gap between No 22 and the properties at Upper Chine. That is because the

¹ APP/P2114/W/17/3167740

extra mass at the western end of No 22 would largely be seen against the backdrop of part of No 22's existing roofscape. I am also of the opinion that the introduction of a storm porch into the western elevation would not encroach to any significant degree into the space between No 22 and Upper Chine. I therefore find that the reduction in the space between Nos 22 and Upper Chine would be insignificant and would have very little effect on the appreciation of the mature trees that lie to the rear of No 22, including the red oak in No 22's garden.

13. While the development would introduce various windows into No 22's front elevation, I consider that they would not have a cluttered appearance, given No 22's scale and the multitude of windows elsewhere in the front elevation.
14. The boundary to the CA runs along the centre line of Church Road and given the scale and appearance of the roof extension, I consider that this development would not be harmful to the CA's setting.
15. I therefore conclude that the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of No 22 or the area. The development would therefore accord with Policy DM2 of the Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including Waste and Minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document of 2012 because it would enhance the existing environment.

Other Matters

16. The flat would be accessed via a new ground floor side access. However, I consider that the position of that entrance relative to Chapel Cottage, and the likely frequency of its use, would mean that its presence would not cause a loss of privacy or disturbance for the occupiers of Chapel Cottage. I also consider that the siting and scale of the roof extension relative to Chapel Cottage would mean that it would not be overbearing for the occupiers of the cottage.

Conclusions

17. While I have found that the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of No 22 or the area, it would provide unacceptable living conditions for its occupiers. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR