

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

By Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/16/3158841
7 Maddoxford Lane, Boorley Green, Botley SO32 2DG

- 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 Mr & Mrs Ian Birkett against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref:F/16/78533 dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension and basement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council amended the description of development to include reference to the new roof to the existing house together with new front and rear dormers in addition to the proposed two storey front extension and basement, and I have taken the overall scheme proposals into my consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and on the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow set on a large plot on the north side of Maddoxford Lane. There are a variety of mainly detached properties in the surrounding area, with a broader mix of chalet bungalows, bungalows and some houses towards the western end of Maddoxford Lane and around its junction with Winchester Road (B3354) and a predominance of bungalows moving further to the east. Although there are a small number of houses, the overall character and appearance of the local area is predominantly of modest chalet bungalows and bungalows on a range of plot sizes. There is an irregular building line in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, with the appeal property being set further back from the road frontage than the bungalows on either side.
5. The proposal would change the roof to the existing dwelling by increasing the eaves height and changing the dormers to the front and introducing two

dormers to the rear. Although these works would add to the overall bulk and massing of the property, I agree with the Council that these works would be acceptable and would not materially affect its overall scale and form and impact on the wider street scene.

6. However, in addition to these works a large front extension is proposed at right angles to the existing property; this would include a basement that would be partly visible as well as accommodation over the double garage in the hipped roof space. I have noted that the ridge of the proposed roof to this extension would be set down from the ridge of the new roof to the main house. However, it would almost double the depth of the property at its western end, and together with the bulky hipped roof, this forward extension would be a very dominant addition to the existing property and would add significantly to its bulk and massing. Even taking into account the proposed works to the roof form of the existing property, I consider that the proposed forward extension would be an over bulky addition that would overwhelm the scale and proportions of the host dwelling. I do not, therefore, agree with the Appellant's contention that the front extension would appear as a subservient addition to the existing property.
7. As a result of its enlarged form, the property would be overly dominant in relation to the scale of the adjoining bungalows as well as in street scene views, particularly when approaching from the east. Its resultant scale and massing would, in my view, be visually discordant in relation to the surrounding pattern of development and this would harm the character and appearance of the local area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001 - 2011 and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document: *Quality Places*, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), all of which seek a high standard of design which respects the local context. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to Policy DM1 of the submitted Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. I understand that following the concerns of the Local Plan Inspector this draft Plan has been set to one side with work being undertaken on a new Plan. This limits significantly the weight that can be attached to this Policy although I note that it largely continues the objectives and criteria set out under Policy 59.BE.
9. I have been provided with an appeal decision which refused permission for a similar proposal under the reference APP/W1715/D/16/3152314. Although there are differences between the two proposals, these are, in my view, limited in extent. I have found nothing in that decision which conflicts with the decision I have reached in this case.
10. I have sympathy with the requirements of the Appellants for additional accommodation but this does not, on its own, outweigh the harm I have concluded. I have also taken into account the size of the plot and that it could physically accommodate the proposed works, but my principal concern relates to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the surrounding area.

11. The Appellants have indicated that they would be prepared to accept a condition to ensure a consistency in the fenestration design and details across the extended property, but this would not overcome the harm I have concluded.
12. I appreciate that some of the windows in the adjoining property at No 9 face towards the appeal site. However, given the spacing and relationship of the appeal property with this dwelling, I do not consider that there would be any harm to the living conditions of these neighbours through loss of outlook or overlooking. I also consider that in terms of protecting the living conditions of the neighbours on the western side, there would be no material harm, taking into account the siting of that dwelling in relation to the scheme proposals. The Council has also raised no issue in respect of the effect of the proposals on the living conditions of the neighbours.
13. In view of the harm I have concluded to the built environment I am unable to agree with the Appellants' contention that the proposal would meet each of the dimensions of sustainable development set out under Paragraph 7 of the Framework.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR