
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/21/3279425

4 Privett Road, Waterlooville PO7 5HJ

- 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 Dr Rob Turner against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/21/00513, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey front extension with 2no side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 2 and 6 Privett Road, with specific reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site relates to a one-and-a-half storey dwelling set within a street whereby there is a mix of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey houses, many of which have undergone alterations and extensions over time.
4. The host dwelling is set back from both immediate neighbouring houses to each side, which both have windows at ground floor level facing the appeal site. 2 Privett Road has a kitchen window on its east facing flank elevation and 6 Privett Road has fenestration to its west facing elevation, illuminating its porch and hallway, as well as living area beyond.
5. Notwithstanding the presence of front dormer roof extensions in the road, I could see nothing similar to the proposed design within the immediate street scene. I have had regard to the specific examples given to me by the appellant, however, whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of those or otherwise, ultimately, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
6. The proposed front extension would be of a considerable depth, the overall bulk and massing of which would be compounded by the changing ground levels down from the rear of the site towards the road. Whilst I accept no6 itself is a rather imposing feature within the road, nonetheless the proposed front

extension, by virtue of its overall scale, combined with the flat roof dormers to each side, would give rise to a bulky design that would be out of keeping with the host building and the visual amenities of the locality.

7. I note the appellant's concerns with regard to the Third Party representations that were sent to the Council and that some of those are not material planning considerations. Nonetheless the planning system operates in the public interest and I consider that overall the proposal before me would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
8. I accept that the appeal dwelling as it currently sits within its plot is recessive in relation to both adjacent dwellings and I note that the Council do not raise an objection to the principle of extending the dwelling, notwithstanding other impacts which I cover below. I also have sympathy that the current flat roof is leaking and that the subject dwelling is clearly in need of some form of modernisation. However, I am not convinced that the design, by virtue of its overall scale, is acceptable in this instance.
9. I therefore find on this issue that the proposal conflicts with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 which only permits planning permission for developments that are designed to a high standard and must demonstrate that their design, amongst other things, identifies and responds positively to local character within or close to the proposed development site and contributes to the improvement of the public realm close to it.

Living Conditions

1. Above I referred to windows on the facing elevations of nos 2 and 6 Privett Road. By virtue of its depth, the proposed extension would significantly restrict the outlook from these windows, notwithstanding that I accept that due to orientation, the sunlight received by them would be limited. Nonetheless it has not been demonstrated by the appellant the impacts that the proposal would have upon the daylight received by these neighbouring windows.
2. I accept that the proposal would not give rise to loss of privacy to surrounding residents and indeed the Council did not refuse planning permission on such grounds. The comments made with regard to a potential boundary dispute constitute a civil matter and therefore is not a determining factor in this appeal.
3. Overall, I consider that the proposed development, by virtue of its depth would have a detrimental impact upon the outlook from and the light available to the occupiers of 2 and 6 Privett Road and from this basis the proposal conflicts with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 which, in addition to that referred to previously, stipulates that planning permission will only be granted if a development is designed to a high standard and does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours.

Conclusion

4. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey INSPECTOR