



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2025

by **Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12TH February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/24/3357371

48 Fir Copse Road, Waterlooville PO7 5HZ

- 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 Keith Williams against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/24/00753.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application as “This is for a very large single storey rear extension, flat roof with white rendered and olive green cladding/upvc windows and three bedrooms”.
-

Preliminary matter

1. During my site visit I was able to assess the effect of the proposal from the neighbouring property at 50 Fir Copse Road.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling at 50 Fir Copse Road, with regard to whether the extension would appear overbearing.

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a semi-detached bungalow with a main pitched roof and hipped end. There is a flat roof single storey rear addition but this is fairly shallow, having a noticeably lesser depth than that of the pitched roof part of the dwelling. However, the proposed development would result in a flat roof single storey rear projection with a depth considerably greater than that of the pitched roof part. It would also span virtually the full width of the dwelling, only being set in fairly modestly and stepping back further from the boundary towards the end on the southern side.
5. I acknowledge that the flat roof is an attempt to make the development less imposing to the neighbours. Due to the position of the extension in the back garden there would be no harm to the streetscene. The Appellant points out that the extended dwelling would only occupy about 25% of the overall plot.

6. Nevertheless, despite these matters and due to the above factors, the enlarged property would be unacceptably dominated by the addition. Because of its extent it would be unduly at odds with the pitched roof character, despite the single storey height. In these circumstances the extension would be a discordant, incongruous and disproportionately elongated feature.
7. The Appellant indicates that planning permission has been granted for single storey rear extensions at other nearby properties and identifies specific cases. However, I have not been provided with the full details and background such as approved plans. As a result, there is nothing to show that any comparably sized extensions to that now proposed have been approved or that the Council's decision making has been unreasonably inconsistent. I also saw at my site visit that the dwelling at no 50 does not have any substantial flat roofed rear additions similar in extent to that now proposed.
8. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the character and appearance of the host dwelling would be harmed. There would be conflict with Havant Borough Core Strategy (CS), March 2011, Policy CS16, which, among other things, seeks to ensure that development is designed to a high standard and responds to, draws inspiration from and respects the context.
9. The development would be contrary to the advice in the Havant Borough Council, Borough Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, December 2011, that single storey extensions should not dominate and be more modest in scale than the main building.
10. The extension would, according to the Council, project approximately 7.6m beyond the rear wall of the adjacent dwelling at no 50 and be only 0.55m from the side boundary. These dimensions have not been disputed by the Appellant. I saw at my site visit that the addition, with a height of about 3.2m, would rise appreciably higher than the boundary fence. Part of the addition towards the end would be next to an outbuilding. However, it would also be noticeably higher than this. Given the depth, proximity and height of the development, as well as the relatively narrow rear garden at no 50, there would be an unpleasant and oppressive sense of enclosure at the outside amenity space of the neighbouring property. This would occur despite any difference in ground levels.
11. As a result, the extension would appear overbearing and it is concluded that the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling would be harmed. As a result, there would be conflict with CS Policy CS16, the aims of which include seeking to prevent such detrimental effects.
12. In the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) it is indicated that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations. These include adding to the overall quality of the area and being visually attractive. The Framework also indicates that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. The failure to satisfy these considerations means that there would also be conflict with the Framework.
13. The Appellant expresses dissatisfaction with the Council's handling of the planning application and indicates that the proposal follows a previous refusal of planning permission. I also note that there have been no objections to the planning

application from neighbours or any other interested party. Nevertheless, these matters do not confer acceptability on the proposal which I must consider on its own merits. In this case the additional bedrooms to meet the needs of the Appellant's family would be achieved at the unacceptable expense of the quality of the built environment.

14. The Council has also raised concerns in relation to the effect on trees at no 46 Fir Copse Road, as well as the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of that dwelling and overlooking in relation to no 50. However, regardless of these matters, the harm that I have found in relation to fundamental planning considerations is sufficient to justify rejecting the appeal. Taking account of all other matters raised, it is therefore determined that the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR