
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2023

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/23/3321113

3 Arran Close, Cosham, Portsmouth, PO6 3UD

- 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 Andrew Carr against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00435/HOU, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2023.
 - The development proposed the conversion of existing outbuilding to residential area, incorporating construction of additional floor and link extension at ground & first floor levels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey house on a small higher quality modern residential estate. It is an area of established and fairly spacious residential character, pleasing appearance, and with varied house types set in an informal layout, which all leads to a good standard of residential amenity. The appeal proposal is as described above.

Living conditions

4. As a result of the irregular layout the relationship of the appeal property to the neighbouring No 4 Arran Close is not the more normal parallel side-to-side situation. There is a diagonal arrangement which means that the rear elevation of appeal dwelling is somewhat angled towards the rear garden of No 4. The proposed development is focussed on the side closest to this boundary.
 5. Even allowing for higher ground levels at No 4 this relationship and proposal mean that the rear part of the planned two storey element would be simply too close and too intrusive to the nearest part of the neighbouring garden. There would be a very uncomfortable sense of dominance and reduction in available open outlook.
-

6. Furthermore, whilst suburban housing usually has some inter-visibility between plots, there would be an unacceptable increase in the degree of scope for overlooking and consequent loss of privacy. Finally, given proximity and orientation there would at times be a reduction of daylight and sunlight to a small, but key, part of the garden of No 4.
7. Residents who live in this locality would reasonably expect some sense of space and other amenity attributes and unfortunately this unneighbourly proposal would overly impinge upon these living standards.
8. Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan 2012 is pertinent. Amongst other matters it seeks to secure well-designed development which would protect standards of residential amenity for neighbours. Given the foregoing I would conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with this policy.

Other matters

9. I do understand the Appellant's wish to extend this property and I note that the Council rightly did not raise concerns on a number of technical, principle and aesthetic factors. I recognise that there would be some economic and social gains forthcoming from the scheme but given impacts upon neighbours I would not deem this as sustainable development. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR