



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/D/21/3271307

112 Great Preston Road, Ryde, Isle of Wight, PO33 1DD.

- 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 Madeleine Coe against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council
 - The application Ref 20/02009/HOU, dated 6 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as *extension to rear elevation to increase footprint on ground floor. Inclusive of balcony terrace above surrounded by privacy screen glass to minimise views into adjacent dwellings.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property as well as the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of numbers 110 and 114 Great Preston Road. In terms of its potential to result in a loss of natural light, outlook and privacy due to overlooking to number 110 and appearing overbearing to the occupiers of number 114 as well as loss of privacy due to overlooking.

Reasons

First main issue:

3. The appeal property, 112 Great Preston Road, is one half of a semi-detached pair of two-storey dwellings. The land falls from the road at the front to the far end of the rear garden. Accordingly, there is a steep drop between ground floor level and rear garden.
4. The appellant proposes a single storey, flat roofed dining room extension together with raised decking to its south east side and rear.
5. The proposed addition would, in contrast to the existing brick elevations of the host property, be clad in timber. This, in terms of its appearance, would give it the character of a subservient extension to the main house. If well detailed

this could be an attractive design solution, by adding to the visual interest of the dwelling as extended.

6. However, the southern flank wall of the proposed addition is not shown set in from the flank wall of the main house. In my judgement, this would make for a poorly articulated junction between the extension and house.
7. Further, due to the proposed height of the extension its flat roof would be at the same level as the banding work between the ground floor brickwork and the first floor render finish. This again would make for an awkward, and unsightly, junction between the extension and house.
8. Although, small these considerations would serve to denude the clean simple lines of the contemporary addition as proposed to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property.
9. Due to the topography of the site the proposed raised decking would, by reason of its overall footprint, changes in level and privacy screens appear as an extensive and incongruous structure in the rear garden. When considered in conjunction with the proposed extension it would, overall appear as a large and obtrusive development. Although not visible from the street it would be readily visible from surrounding properties.
10. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposal would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property as well as the character and appearance of the area contrary to the objectives of Policy DM2 of the Island Plan – Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including Waste and Minerals) and Development Management Development Plan Document (Adopted March 2012) (LP) as they relate to the quality of development.

Second main issue:

11. The proposed extension would project about 4.5 meters from the rear façade of the existing house and would be built within about 0.9 meter or so of the boundary to number 110.
12. As I saw number 110 has a ground floor rear window close to the common boundary. Due to the relationship of the proposed extension to the window in the rear wall of number 110, its overall depth and the orientation of the properties. I consider that the proposal would result in both a loss of sunlight and overshadowing of that window. However, given the size of the garden, the location and orientation of the window I do consider that the proposed addition would result in a significant loss of natural light or outlook.
13. As a result of the garden levels, raised decking and the proposed height of the privacy screens there is the potential for anyone standing on the proposed deck to look directly into the rear gardens of both number 110 and 114 resulting in a loss of privacy.
14. I acknowledge that the height of the privacy screens could be raised to overcome this problem. However, this would only serve to increase the overall mass of the decking increasing the harm to the visual amenity of the rear garden area.
15. The Council is concerned that, due to the height and depth of the proposed extension it would appear to be a looming and overbearing addition when

viewed from the garden of number 114. However, while having regard to the separation distance and the choice of timber cladding for the proposed addition, I do not agree that it would appear so overbearing as to cause harm to residential living conditions.

16. I conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 114 as a result of appearing overbearing.
17. Further, it would not result in a loss of outlook or natural light to number 110. However, it would result in overshadowing, loss of sunlight and overlooking leading to a loss of privacy of numbers 110 and 114 so as to cause significant harm to the occupiers living conditions. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of LP Policy DM2 as it seeks to protect residential living conditions.

Other Matters

18. I appreciate the appellants desire to provide a safe, shallow access to the rear garden. However, I consider that there may well be other ways of achieving this without causing the harm to residential living conditions I have identified.

Conclusions

19. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR