



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2023

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J1725/D/22/3302198

12 Burney Road, Alverstoke, Gosport, Hampshire PO12 2QB

- 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 Andrew Peach against the decision of Gosport Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00632/FULL, dated 13 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "room in the roof".
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, it would be more accurate to refer to the proposal as the erection of a rear extension to form living accommodation within the roof. This is the wording used by the Council on the decision notice and entered by the appellant onto Section E of the appeal form. It is more precise and therefore I have used it in my formal decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of rear extension to form living accommodation within the roof at 12 Burney Road, Alverstoke, Hampshire PO12 2QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00632/FULL, dated 13 January 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan and Drawing No 210819 1A1 2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of adjacent properties, with regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached bungalow with rooms in the roof and a single-storey, flat roof addition at the rear. The proposal is to extend above the flat roof with a dual-pitched roof to enlarge the first floor accommodation.
5. The properties on either side are both bungalows. No 14 to the west has a conservatory which infills the gap between the back wall of the dwelling and a rear outrigger. This conservatory has its principal outlook onto the back garden (as evidenced by the orientation of furniture) but there are also views onto the fence along the side boundary and No 12's single-storey extension. The roof of the proposed extension would be visible to users of the conservatory, but only if they were to stand by the window and look upwards. Even in these views, the plane of the roof would slope away from the boundary, so it would not be particularly imposing. There is no technical evidence before me regarding daylight and sunlight impacts, but in my opinion any harm in this regard is likely to be negligible. Sunlight into the conservatory will already be minimal as a consequence of its position, orientation facing north and semi-opaque roof.
6. No 10 Burney Road also has a conservatory, but this structure has an opaque roof and its appearance does not give the impression of habitable space. The proposed extension would extend beyond the rear wall of the conservatory (and the outrigger to which it is attached) by somewhere in the order of 4m. The additional roof mass would be visible to the occupants of the conservatory, but only if they stand by the window and crane their neck upwards. Of course, the development would be experienced when outside the dwelling and there would be some additional sense of enclosure. However, the garden is spacious with an open aspect and the new section of roof would pitch away from the boundary with slightly lower eaves. Whilst the outlook of the neighbour would change, I do not consider that the development would be overbearing. I have not seen any information to persuade me that it would lead to a material loss of natural light.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings. I find no conflict with Policy LP10 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 or the supporting Design Supplementary Planning Document, insofar as they seek to promote good design which avoids harm by reason of loss of light or outlook.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard commencement condition I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty. A matching materials condition is also necessary to secure harmonious architectural treatment, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from the neighbours, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR