

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2023

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/23/3318294

14 Rosetta Drive, East Cowes, Isle of Wight, PO32 6EN

- 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 C Hicks against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02019/HOU, dated 8 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and b) living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The semi-detached two storey appeal property is at the end of a short row of homes within a small 1990's residential estate. The estate is of high to mid density suburban character with the thoughtful semi-informal layout and variation in levels giving some sense of spacious character and a pleasing streetscene. The appeal property is on an unusual almost triangular end plot and the gable ended dwelling has substantial ancillary single storey structures as part of its fabric. The appeal scheme is to erect a first floor hipped roof extension over the property's flat roofed garage.
 4. The estate benefits from properties being individually discreet; scale and design are subtle and very little looks 'crammed-in'. Unfortunately, the planned scheme would run counter to this character. To my mind the proposal would radiate an appearance of over-development as the extended home would look too large for the plot. The scheme would overly reduce the modest relief from two storey buildings in this corner and look unduly tight on this restricted site, which is not helped by adjoining higher ground. I say this even having regard to the architect's use of a set-in from the front elevation and lower ridge. These are often approaches which would be commended on first floor side extensions but are simply not sufficient mitigation in this instance where the issue is more fundamental.
-

5. Policy DM2 of the Island Plan Core Strategy (CS) is relevant. Amongst other matters, it seeks to secure development with good design quality which respects context, creates an attractive built environment and protects local character. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with this policy.

Living conditions

6. Existing residents in the three dwellings which abut the rear boundary of the appeal property do not have overly generous rear garden lengths. However as result of relative angles of their elevations, the drop in levels to the appeal property, and the present distance back of the two-storey element on the subject house the relevant neighbours do have a sense of spaciousness and open aspect. Even with occasional sheds they can enjoy this feeling of space from their gardens and via outlook from rear facing windows. Regrettably this would markedly change were the appeal scheme to be built. Even with 'advantageous' levels and a hipped roof the planned built form would be over-dominant. There would be an uncomfortable sense of being hemmed-in; living conditions would noticeably decline. Overly substantial built structure would be brought too near the pertinent boundary.
7. Previously cited CS Policy DM2 is also relevant to this issue. Amongst other matters, this seeks to ensure new development has regard to adjacent buildings and the social, or amenity, context which exists. I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to this policy.

Other matters

8. I sympathise with the wish to improve bedroom space and I can see that thought has been given to matching materials and matters such as window disposition. I recognise that the plot is an unusual one shape-wise. I would agree that the existing extent of single storey flat roofing to the side of the house is something of an anomaly. However, I do not find it jarring on the eye within the streetscene and as it stands it does not impede upon neighbouring amenity. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but taken individually or together these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issues identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality as well as on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR