



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2024

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/23/3332665

109 Haslar Crescent, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO7 6DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Warren Stanley against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/23/00370.
 - The development proposed is described as rooms in a re-pitched roof and a rear extension to the kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. That the proposal went through several iterations during the application process is noted. As the final version of the plans are those the Council made its decision on, I have taken those into consideration.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its immediate locality, and the living conditions of the occupants of 107 and 111 Haslar Crescent with specific regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The host dwelling is in a suburban residential area predominantly constituting semi-detached and detached bungalows with relatively compact rear gardens. The properties are functionally designed and generally rectilinear in form. There are examples of dormers, converted roof spaces, and extensions which creates some individuality between properties and interest within the street scene. There is a relatively strong uniformity in the roof styles which are generally gabled and even those with extensions or dormers appear to maintain a similar ridge height.
5. The proposal would square the dog leg in the rear elevation and introduce 4 dormers to the roof, which would require the ridge of the existing roof to be raised by 0.4metres, as calculated by the Council.

6. Although it is appreciated that the proposed dormers are an honest and functional design which is replicated within the immediate area. The proposal would require an increase in ridge height which would in turn alter the pitch of the roof. As the appeal property has its gable facing the road this change in pitch and height would be visually obvious. In isolation this would not harm the appearance of the host dwelling. However, as the host dwelling is relatively prominent in the street scene, due to its proximity to the junction with Charlesworth Drive, this would have an overly dominating and therefore harmful effect on the character and appearance of the immediate locality.
7. The development at 25 Charlesworth Drive is noted. However, without construction details I am unable to make direct comparison with the scheme before me in terms of whether the ridge height was increased. Although on observations during my site visit it did not appear to extend above the ridges of the properties on either side.
8. For the reasons given above I therefore find that the proposed increase in ridge height would harm the character and appearance of the immediate locality. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (CS) insofar as it seeks new development to respect the local context and use the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design. It would also fail to comply with the guidance in the Havant Borough Design Guides Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as far as it requires new development to follow the typical pattern of existing properties.

Living conditions

9. The host dwelling sits between 107 and 111 Haslar Crescent, both single storey detached bungalows. No 107 is orientated like the host dwelling, whilst No 111 has its gables located along the side elevations. Within the proposed dormers there would be 4 windows which would face No 107 and 3 which would face No 111.
10. The 2 middle windows which would face No 107 are proposed to service a shower room and stairwell so could be obscure glazed. However, all the other windows would be in bedrooms and so it would not be appropriate to obscure glaze them. Nevertheless the 3 windows proposed for bedroom 1 (1 facing No 107, and 2 facing No 111) would be located to the front of the host dwelling with views limited to the front gardens and driveways of both Nos 107 and 111. These areas are already clearly visible from the road and so additional overlooking from the proposed windows would not affect the privacy of the occupants of both properties.
11. The proposed dormer windows to the rear would be the only windows for 2 bedrooms (bedroom 2 facing No 107, and bedroom 3 facing No 111) and provide views over the rear gardens of both Nos 107 and 111. However No 107 has a flat roofed extension directly to the rear and this would screen most views of the portion of No 107's garden closest to the house. Accordingly, I am satisfied that although some of the garden of No 107 would be visible from the proposed bedroom 2 window it would be limited and would not substantially add to the overlooking of that garden beyond that which already exists from other adjacent properties.
12. The proposed window for bedroom 3 would provide similar views of the rear garden of No 111. However, the rear extension at No 111 is a conservatory and

so views out of the proposed bedroom 3 window would be into the rear of No 111, and this would be harmful to the privacy of the occupants of that property and so have an unacceptable impact on their living conditions.

13. It is appreciated the appellant does not envisage bedroom 3 being used other than in the evening when the curtains would be drawn. Nevertheless, there is no way to secure or limit the use of that proposed space nor its window and therefore this does not overcome the harm identified.
14. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 111 with specific regard to privacy. It would not comply with CS Policy CS16 insofar as it seeks new development to not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbours through the loss of privacy.

Other Matters

15. It is noted that interested parties were concerned relating to on road parking and construction working hours. However, as I am dismissing the appeal, I have not pursued these matters further.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the Framework, which would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR