



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/21/3267130

15 Louis Road, Lake, Isle of Wight, PO36 9HT.

- 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 Jonathan Hillman against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01488/HOU, dated 4 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations to include rear dormer and side hip-to-gable enlargement; two-storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the wider area; and
 - b) the effect of proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 11a Louis Road in terms of its potential for dominance, overshadowing and reduction in outlook and number 17 in respect of dominance.

Reasons

First main issue:

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 15 Louis Road, is one half of a semi-detached pair of houses. The pair are one of a number of hipped roofed two-storey dwellings on this side of the road. The road comprises a mix of both hipped and gable roofed dwellings.
4. The appellant proposes removing the existing hipped end and building a new gable end wall, the construction of a large flat roof dormer along with a two-storey side/rear extension. The extension would be flat roofed with a false pitched roof fascia.
5. The proposed replacement of the existing hip with a gable would dramatically change the three-dimension form of the host property as well as the semi-

- detached pair. Causing an incongruous imbalance in the form and appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses.
6. Further, as I saw the run of hipped roof dwellings of which this is one have all retained their original hipped roof form. Accordingly, and notwithstanding that gables are a feature of other nearby roofs, the introduction of a gable end here would seriously detract the symmetry of the roof design of the immediate neighbouring properties in the road.
 7. The proposed wrap around extension would, by reason of, its pitched fascia roof design and the lack of fenestration or modelling appear as a large, bulky, bland and discordant addition here. By reason of its location, it would, as well as detracting from the architectural integrity of the host property, cause harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene.
 8. The proposed dormer would extend virtually across the full width of the roof as enlarged. Further, it would be built practically from eaves level to the ridge line. Consequently, it would appear as a large, bulky and dominant addition poorly related to the scale of the roof and the pitched fascia roof form of the proposed two-storey extension.
 9. Furthermore, the proposed windows in the extension and dormer would generally reflect the style of the existing and be proportionate to them. However, from the design drawings, they would appear poorly positioned in relation to the existing windows retained and each other. This would result in poorly articulated facades .
 10. For the forgoing reasons I conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed development as designed would cause demonstratable harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the wider area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 of the Island Plan – Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including Waste and Minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document (Adopted March 2012) (LP) as it relates, amongst other things to the quality of development and the need to protect, conserve and enhance the existing environment.

Living conditions

11. Based on the block plan it is clear that number 17 has a much smaller rear garden plot when compared to the rear gardens of the other nearby houses. Therefore, given the height, depth and proximity of the addition to number 17 I concur with the Council's view that when taken together with the gable wall and dormer proposals the extension would have an overbearing dominant impact on the living conditions of the occupiers.
12. Number 11a (the other half of the semi-detached pair) is located to the south of the appeal property. The proposed two-storey addition would project about 4.3 meters from the rear of the host property and, at first floor level, be built to about 2.0 meters from the common boundary with 11a. Number 11a has a large window in the west wall of the property. I understand, from the Council's evidence, that this window serves a habitable room, and that room has a secondary window at the front of the house. Notwithstanding the other window, given the height and location of the proposed extension it would, in my judgement, overshadow the window in the west wall. Thereby reducing sunlight to the back of the room and the immediate garden area.

13. Given that the two-storey element of the extension would be set about 2.0 meters or so off the boundary line and as number 11a enjoys a relatively large rear garden I am not persuaded that it would, as feared by the Council, appear either overly dominant or result in a loss of outlook.
14. I conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed addition while not causing harm by reason of over dominance of loss of outlook would so significantly overshadow number 11a as to harm the living conditions of the residential occupiers. Further, it would have a visually overbearing dominance on the occupants of number 17. The proposal is therefore contrary to LP Policy DM2 as it seeks to protect residential living conditions.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has suggested that that the hip to gable extension and the proposed dormer could be undertaken as permitted development by virtue of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO). However, I have seen nothing to suggest he would genuinely pursue this option if the appeal failed or that such a scheme would be similar to, or worse than, what is currently proposed. As such, it is a matter of negligible weight.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR