



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/24/3343498

10 Marjoram Crescent, Waterlooville PO8 9BD

- 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 K Senthuran against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/24/00003.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a single storey side extension, first floor rear extension to form canopy, loft conversion to include raising roof height, 2no dormers to side roof slopes and associated changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 8 Marjoram Crescent, with specific reference to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a detached, gable fronted bungalow within a row of 4no similarly designed properties, bungalows are also located opposite the appeal site; therefore the character of Marjoram Crescent within the immediate locality of the appeal site is of single storey dwellings.
4. The dwelling has a flat roof garage attached to its eastern elevation and the proposal would see the host dwelling extended to the rear of this to the same height, and projecting just beyond its existing rear elevation.
5. I note that the appellant submitted an amended scheme which reduced the width of the proposed dormers slightly, reduced the rear of the first floor extension, and removed a canopy which was originally proposed. As the Council accepted these revised plans, it falls upon me to determine the scheme upon them. However I consider that combined with the increase in the ridge height, the proposed side dormers would give rise to an overdeveloped roof, with an unacceptable bulk and massing which would be harmful to the rhythm of development along the northern side of Marjoram Crescent; and appearing as incongruous with its immediate neighbours.

6. On my site visit I did note some other examples of extensions that have been constructed, however ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and the Havant Borough Council Design Guide which together require development to be designed to a high standard and that dormers should not dominate the roof of an existing building.

Living Conditions

7. The eastern boundary of the appeal site is demarcated by a high close boarded fence with no8's eaves only marginally higher than this. Consequently, the side facing bedroom window of that property has very little outlook and as a consequence unlikely gleans much daylight as well.
8. The side extension would bring built form closer to the boundary, but not as close as the fence, and by virtue of its limited height and flat roof form it would unlikely give rise to a material increase in loss of light to, or outlook from that window.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR