
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2020

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/19/3240560
62 Ferndale, Waterlooville PO7 7PB

- 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 & Mrs Perkins against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/19/00625, dated 14 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "*First floor rear extension; Changes to external wall and roof finish; Replacement of existing windows; Internal reconfiguration*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the appellants' names and description of the proposed development from the planning application form although I note these are expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issues

3. The main issues raised in respect of the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) The living conditions of the adjacent occupiers at 64 Ferndale; and
 - b) The character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions of the adjacent occupiers at 64 Ferndale

4. The proposal would create an extension to the rear of the property of considerable height and projection from the existing rear elevation of the dwellinghouse. I observed that it would also be in close proximity to the boundary of 64 Ferndale. Representation received to the Council's consultation process points to concern that the proposal would much alter the outlook from the garden of No 64 and the opinion is expressed that this would have a severe adverse visual impact.

5. I accept that the proposal would not encroach upon the 45-degree eyeline from the rear windows of No 64 and the separation would retain light to the windows and the garden. Nonetheless, the first-floor extension would be an extremely large and elevated addition to the appeal dwelling and would be clearly visible in close proximity in the outlook from the rear garden of No 64. Given its large overall size and close relationship to No 64 the first-floor addition would be an extremely dominant feature. It would have an overbearing impact upon the outdoor living environment of the occupiers of this property.
6. The rear garden is an outdoor living space in which the occupiers of No 64 are likely to spend a reasonable amount of their time, particularly during those months of clement weather. The proposed extension would be harmful to the occupiers of this property as it would diminish the outlook from the rear outdoor living environment, an outlook that the existing adjoining occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy. Whilst there still would be outlook from the rear garden toward Stratford Road, the first floor extension would loom clearly as a large dominant feature when viewed in the direction of Stratford Road.
7. My attention has been drawn to two-storey extensions at the rears of 70 and 74 Ferndale, however, I have not been advised as to when those extensions were permitted and under what policy circumstances. Furthermore, from the aerial photographs provided, their physical form and relationship with adjoining properties appears to me to potentially represent examples of development that should not necessarily be replicated elsewhere as those extensions could potentially have had a harmful impact upon the adjoining occupiers living conditions.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 64 Ferndale. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2011 and the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011. This policy and SPD require, amongst other matters, development not to cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through outlook. Furthermore, the proposal would not achieve a high standard of amenity as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Character and appearance

9. The appeal property is located in an established residential area that hosts a mixed style of dwellings, designs and materials. It is clear from the plans that a modern approach has been taken to the design of the proposed first floor rear extension and the other alterations to the dwelling are intended to re-model and modernise the overall appearance of the existing property. The changes to the dwelling, along with the proposed rear first floor extension, would create a dwelling of different appearance to those 1950/60s properties in the area. However, I note that some alterations, such as the changes to the windows, could take place without the need to gain planning permission.
10. Although the existing development in the area reflects the designs of the era in which it was built, there is nonetheless variety to the designs and appearances of the dwellings that incorporate a range of different materials. In this context, I do not consider the modern design approach to the alterations to the existing building would be substantially out of keeping or visually jarring.

11. Turning to the proposed first floor rear extension that would be positioned above the existing single storey ground extension, it would be of flat roof design and finished in white render. The existing dwelling is proposed to be rendered and the roof changed to slate. The existing ground floor addition would be clad with timber slats and a zinc clad linking element is proposed that would connect the first floor of the main dwelling with the first-floor extension. The modern fenestration features, as well as the first floor overhang to the rear, are characteristic of modern architecture. Whilst different by design and form when compared to that of the existing development in the locality, in terms of the first floor rear extension's bulk, design and finishing materials, it would not appear out of context with the existing dwelling when re-modelled. In the context of surrounding existing development that is of mixed character and design, I do not consider the extension would be significantly visually out of keeping as there is no prevailing distinct uniformity to this residential area's design and appearance.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposed development would not materially conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2011 and the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 that require development to be designed to a high standard.
13. Notwithstanding the above, the rear extension would be a large addition to the dwelling. Even though its design would lend itself to visually assimilating with the existing dwelling once re-modelled, this does not overcome my concerns with regard to the first-floor addition being an unacceptably dominant feature in the outlook of the adjoining occupiers at 64 Ferndale.

Conclusion

14. I note a number of other concerns have been raised to the proposal by interested parties, such as, the proposed raised platform to the rear, but in view of my conclusions on the first main issue there is no need for me to address these in the current decision.
15. For the reasons given above, and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR