



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X/1735/D/25/3368912

63 Geoffrey Avenue, Waterlooville PO7 5BH

- 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 Gary Newing against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is APP/24/00828.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension measuring 3.78m in depth from the existing conservatory wall; enlargement of front dormer to reflect other properties within the street scene and enlargement of rear facing flat roof dormer; removal of gable roof over front bay window and insertion of pitched roof light to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 65 Geoffrey Avenue as regards outlook and light.

Reasons

3. Nos. 63 and 65 are a pair of semi-detached properties with the building footprint either adjoining or close to the flank boundaries of the combined site. The appeal scheme includes a single storey flat roof rear extension which the Officer's Report explains would involve the removal of an existing rear outshoot and conservatory and extend a further 3.78m into the garden at a maximum 3.1m height and 5.8m width. At this width the extension would extend to the boundary with No. 65 but with a depth 0.8m less than that of the existing conservatory at this neighbour.
4. As part of my visit to assess the appeal scheme, at the suggestion of the Council I visited No. 65. In the conservatory there is currently a view through the existing side windows over the boundary fence of a substantial area of sky and indeed the crown of a large tree which appears to be in a garden beyond No. 63.
5. The 3m height of the proposed extension would close down much of that outlook at close quarters with the remaining aspect limited to the 0.8m shortfall of the extension at the rear. And whilst I have noted the mitigating factors of the other windows in the conservatory in the Officer's Report, I consider that the effect of this enclosure would be one of significantly reducing the amenity of the conservatory in respect of outlook.
6. The outlook over No. 63 is almost due south and consequently the proposed addition would also have a substantially adverse impact on the light currently

enjoyed in the conservatory by the occupiers of No. 65. Furthermore, the living room of this dwelling which leads into the conservatory almost wholly relies on the conservatory windows for its light, and at the time of my visit the light level inside this room was already noticeably poor. Bearing in mind that my visit was late morning in early September on a sunny day, I consider it reasonable to conclude that if the appeal scheme were to go ahead, the result would be an even darker room for a substantial part of the year, comprising wholly unacceptable living conditions.

7. I have had regard to all the points raised in the grounds of appeal and indeed the Officer's Report which considered, on balance, that there would not be an unacceptable impact on both outlook and light. The point was also made that the existing clear glazing of the conservatory fenestration facing No. 63 was originally precluded by a condition requiring obscure glazing.
8. Be that as it may, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not adequately safeguard the living conditions as regards outlook and light for existing and future occupiers of No. 65. Accordingly, the proposal is in harmful conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and with Government policy in paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
9. The appeal therefore fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR