
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/21/3277912

2 Hillis Cottages, Hillis Gate Road, Northwood PO31 8NA

- 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 Ian Hayden against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00869/HOU, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two storey extension revised'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are;
 - i) The effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and
 - ii) The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No 1 Hillis Cottages, with particular regard to levels of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a pair of small traditional semi-detached stone cottages. The proposal seeks to demolish an existing ground floor rear extension and to construct a two-storey extension, which would span the width of the host dwelling and project around 4.4 metres beyond its rear elevation.
4. The appeal extension, due to its full width and excessive depth in relation to the limited size of the original cottage, would be overly dominant. It would subsume the existing rear elevation of the cottage and appear unacceptably bulky. Consequently, the proposed extension would be overly prominent within the wider landscape, particularly when viewed when approaching the site from the south-west on Hillis Gate Road.
5. I recognise that the proposed painted render finish and low ridge height would reinforce the appearance of the extension as an addition to the main property. However, the variation between the external wall materials of the host dwelling and proposed extension would exacerbate the prominence of the extension in

the context of the existing cottage. Therefore, this does not alter my view that the proposal would be overly dominant in relation to the host dwelling.

6. In view of the above, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DM2 of the Island Plan: The Isle of Wight Council Core Strategy (including minerals and waste) and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012) (LP) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to secure high quality design which responds to local context.

Living conditions

7. The depth and mass of the proposed two storey extension, along with its position on the side boundary with the adjoining cottage, No 1 Hillis Cottages, would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to this neighbouring dwelling. It would also unduly restrict the level of daylight to the neighbours' existing ground and first floor windows. On this basis, the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the level of daylight to and outlook from the neighbours' dwelling.
8. I note the appellant's comments that limited weight should be given to any impact on the neighbours' first floor window as it is not a 'heavily used habitable room'. However, the residents of No 1 can reasonably expect to enjoy a satisfactory level of daylight to, and outlook from, this habitable room. I therefore afford very little weight to this point in my consideration of this appeal.
9. In view of the above, the appeal proposal would significantly harm the living conditions of the residents of the neighbouring property, No 1 Hillis Cottages. The scheme would therefore be contrary to the objectives of LP Policy DM2 which seeks to protect residential living conditions.

Other Matters

10. I recognise that the proposed extension has been reduced from a previous scheme, in an attempt to overcome the Council's previous reasons for refusal. However, this does not go far enough to address the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

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

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR