

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/16/3164387

5 Augustus Way, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Hants SO53 2BD

- 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 and Mrs D Sahota against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application ref: F/16/79001, dated 29 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor alterations at 5 Augustus Way, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Hants SO53 2BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/16/79001, dated 29 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing nos. A, AA, B, C and D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. No. 5 Augustus Way is a 'chalet-style' bungalow which forms one half of a semi-detached pair. To the front it has two rectilinear dormer windows, one of which is contiguous with the dormer on its attached neighbour at no. 3. The adjacent semi-detached pair at nos. 7 and 9 are in a similar style. Elsewhere on Augustus Way and adjoining roads I observed some variety in terms of the form and appearance of the properties. They include some two storey buildings and

others, such as at no. 1 Augustus Way, with first floor accommodation contained within steeply-pitched roofs. Some of the properties have rectilinear dormer windows of varying sizes, and which take up differing proportions of their respective roof slope.

4. As the proposal would bridge the gap between no. 5's existing dormers it would result in an elongated section of roof level development to the front and rear. Taken together with the attached dormer at no. 3, the Council calculates that on the front elevation it would be approximately 13m long. However, the resultant roof level development would still be set in from these two properties' gables, and it would be set well down from the ridge and well above the eaves, thus leaving a significant area of sloping roof. The proposed alterations would also respect the form and materials of the pair's existing dormers. Consequently, the scheme would not give the host property or the pair an overly 'top-heavy' appearance.
5. Although the roof level development on this pair would be longer than other such development that I observed on nearby buildings, given my conclusions regarding the surrounding dwellings' varied style and form, it would not harm the area's character and appearance, and would not appear overly dominant or incongruous in the streetscene.
6. I have considered the requirement of the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document 2011 that changes to the shape of a property's roof need to be carefully considered. However, this is not a street with a very uniform roof design, and in any event the style and appearance of the resultant roof here would broadly respect the style and form of the existing dormers, and it would not appear overly-dominant.
7. The scheme would not conflict with policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011 (2006) which, amongst other things and in broad terms, requires that development take account of the site's context, and the character and appearance of the locality with regard to matters including mass, scale and design. Although I note that the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 has not been adopted, the scheme would not conflict with emerging policy DM1's similar stance. It would also not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') requirements for good design, and promotion of local distinctiveness and character. The appeal will therefore be allowed.
8. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the Framework's tests. In addition to the standard time limit condition, as it provides certainty, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings. Finally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be faced in matching materials. For the above reasons, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR