
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/19/3240912

4 East Pallant, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 1EA.

- 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 Jason Bradwell against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/19/00741 dated 24 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 East Pallant in terms of the potential for the proposed addition to have an overbearing impact and result in a loss of natural light and visual outlook.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 4 East Pallant, is a recently built two-storey semi-detached dwelling with number 2 East Pallant. It is located in the St Faith's Conservation Area.
4. Both dwellings enjoy a single storey rear projection with abutting lean-to roofs (dining room). The appeal property also has a later single storey rear and side extension (study and conservatory).
5. The appellant proposes the construction of a first floor rear extension built over the existing dining room as well as the study and conservatory. The extension would project some 6.6 metres or so from the rear wall of the house. It would be built up to the existing eaves line with a shallow pitched hip roof over. From the evidence I understand that it would have an overall ridge height of about 6.25 meters or so.
6. The existing parapet wall to the east flank of the study extension would be extended up above the height of the existing eaves line of the main house for the full depth of the first floor projection.
7. As I observed on site the flank wall of the existing single storey addition, by reason of its depth and location adjacent to the existing ground floor windows

serving the dining room in the north elevation of number 2, already has some impact on natural light to that dining room. In my judgement the proposed increase in the height of the parapet wall would serve to exacerbate this to some limited degree. However, as the room already benefits from a window and French doors in the west wall the increase in height would not, in my opinion, result in such a significant loss of light as to cause harm to the occupants living conditions.

8. Similarly due to the location of the first floor bedroom window and the proposed height of the new parapet wall, when considered in the context of the advice in the Havant Borough Council – *Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (Adopted December 2011) (SPD), there would be no significant loss of sky light received through the bedroom window.
9. However, the increased height of what would be a blank brick wall built right up to the common boundary would appear incongruous and so overbearing as to cause significant harm to the visual outlook of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.
10. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension would cause substantial harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of number 2 East Pallant. The development would therefore not accord with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough - *Core Strategy* (March 2011), SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework as they seek to protect residential amenity.

Other matters

11. The Council found that as the extension would be built to the rear of the property it would serve to preserve the character and appearance of the St Faiths Conservation Area. From what I have seen and read I would concur with the Council's findings in this respect.

Conclusions

12. Having had regard to all matters I have concluded that the proposal would serve to preserve the character and appearance of the St Faiths Conservation Area. However, it would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 2 East Pallant and for that reason the appeal should not succeed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR