

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/23/3330073

26 Queens Road, Newport PO30 1EZ

- 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 Peter Rudd against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application, Ref. 23/00842/HOU, dated 11 May 2023 was refused by notice dated 7 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing conservatory and replacement with an extension to create a garden room and extending on the first floor to create larger bedrooms with an ensuite to the master bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing conservatory and replacement with an extension to create a garden room and extending on the first floor to create larger bedrooms with an ensuite to the master bedroom at 26 Queens Road, Newport in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 23/00842/HOU, dated 11 May 2023 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. NA 23/127/01 & NA 23/127/02;
 - 3) The facing brickwork of the extension shall match that of the existing dwelling in accordance with details first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling, No. 26 Queens Road, is a two-storey house of a conventional traditional design including a fully hipped roof. At the rear there is a single storey lean-to conservatory which would be demolished as part of the appeal scheme.
-

4. This addition would be replaced by a two-storey extension with a flat roof of a 1.8m depth and then dropping down to a mono pitched single storey extension with a further depth of 1.5m. The Council's objection is to the flat roof of the two-storey element, and I agree that this would to some extent be unsympathetic to the host building, with the harm compounded by its height slightly above the eaves.
5. Accordingly, I also agree with the Council's view that the two-storey flat roof would be contrary to Policy DM2 of the Island Plan Core Strategy 2012 which includes a requirement that development proposals should provide an attractive environment and that there will be support for high quality design. There would similarly be conflict with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed and Beautiful Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023. On that basis the Council's refusal of the proposal is ostensibly justified.
6. However, the officer's report refers to the two-storey extension with its 1.8m depth as being 'relatively small'. Whilst I acknowledge that this part of the extension would have a similar width to the dwelling, the fact is that the depth of 1.8m is in fact 'very small', both in relation to the existing house and compared with the usual aspirations of householders for additional floorspace.
7. Furthermore, the appellant explains that *'the flat roof is necessary to comply with insulation requirements whilst maintaining a useable ceiling height in the bedrooms that would be extended'*. I give weight to this argument and I am also minded to agree that the more alternative design of a double pitched roof over the extension would reduce the internal size, add complexity and not be viable. There is additionally some doubt that such a modestly sized addition of this design would read well with the existing 'clean' lines of the hipped roof. I have also given weight to the limited size of the single-storey element of the appeal scheme.
8. Moreover, whilst the officer's report refers to the extension being visible in the street scene by virtue of the lower heights of the neighbouring bungalows, the Refusal Notice itself does not include any reference to the impact on the street scene and the surrounding area. Although presumably an error, I consider this to be appropriate because from my own assessment there would be at most only glimpses of the flanks of the flat roof and these would be insufficient to have any meaningful impact.
9. There would be a slightly jarring impact in views from the back gardens of the adjacent bungalows at Nos. 24 and 28, but neither of their occupiers object to the proposal. The view from the rear windows and garden of No. 37 Shide Road would be directly towards the extension and as seen from this vantage point would be acceptable. I also agree with the appellant that the pitched roof of the single storey extension in a situation where a flat roof would normally be expected would improve the overall design quality and to some degree offset the unorthodox appearance of the flat roof of the two-storey element.
10. On balance, I conclude that because of its very small depth in a position essentially unseen from the public realm and also giving weight to the impracticalities of the alternative design, the appeal should be allowed. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of

proper planning. A condition stipulating matching external walls will facilitate a more harmonious form of development.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR