

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2017

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

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

Decision date: 28 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/16/3165059

9 Hill Rise, Twyford, Winchester, Hampshire SO21 1QH

- 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 D Nash and Miss Treasure Jones against the decision of the South Downs National Park Authority ('the NPA').
 - The application, Ref. SDNP/16/03635/HOUS, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a new rear dormer to the rear and roof lights to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with a new rear dormer to the rear and roof lights to the front at 9 Hill Rise, Twyford, Winchester in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. SDNP/16/03635/HOUS, dated 18 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) Within three months of the date of this Decision, scaled drawings and full written details of the proposed roof alterations including external materials shall be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are: (i) the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the terrace of which it forms a part, and (ii) whether the character or appearance of the Twyford Conservation Area would be preserved or enhanced. As the first issue strongly informs the second, I consider that for the most part I can consider them together.

Reasons

3. The proposed dormer as initially submitted would cover the great majority of the roof slope of No.9 and includes extensive glazing. For the reasons explained in detail in the officer's report, but essentially a disproportionate size and in some respects unsympathetic detailing, I consider that the proposed dormer would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace as a whole and the conservation area.
-

4. However, following discussions with the NPA the appellants have submitted amended sketch drawing No. 02_16/ SK01, which from the information before me appears to have been discussed by the parties, albeit still not acceptable to the NPA. There is some confusion as to whether the decision to refuse permission has been based on the amended plan – the Grounds of Appeal appear to suggest that it has, but there is no reference to this drawing in the schedule of plans forming part of the Notice of Refusal.
5. Leaving that matter temporarily aside, the sketch drawing shows reductions in the size of the dormer with a consequential reduction in its projection and increased distances to the ridge, eaves and the boundary with the adjoining dwelling on the eastern flank. Other amendments appear to be the removal of the glass doors and balustrade (effectively therefore deleting a Juliet balcony) and the introduction of non-reflective glass for the reduced glazed area.
6. In my view the smaller and thereby more proportionate size of the dormer makes it potentially acceptable, especially when a number of other factors are taken into account. The first of these is that in the case of the northern side of Hill Rise (Nos. 7-13,) the rear elevations are dominated by the large gabled outshoots, which interrupt the roof profile, albeit in a rhythmic pattern.
7. The dormer would also be seen against the larger combined area of roof slope of appeal dwelling and the neighbouring property to the east, and in its amended form would line in with the left hand jamb of the appellants' first floor window. The structure would in part sit behind the dwelling's outshoot, whilst the overall roof slope of the terrace already has a couple of dormers, including a gabled dormer towards its western end. Although probably smaller than the current scheme and of a more traditional design, I consider this to be a prominent addition that draws the eye.
8. On a more general point, the limited visibility of the rear roofscape of the terrace is such that there would be no effect on the streetscene, and whilst the NPA has referred to the potential for the dormer being seen from Finch's Lane, the Grounds of Appeal explain that this vantage point is not significant. Firstly it is outside the conservation area, and secondly from this distance the dormer with its position below the ridge and juxtaposed with the outshoot gable would be unlikely to stand out as a discordant addition to the terrace.
9. I acknowledge that the dormer would also be visible from private land within the conservation area and from public land within the National Park. However, as already indicated I am not persuaded that in its amended form it would be perceived as a jarring feature in the local townscape and landscape.
10. On balance, I consider that provided all elements of the dormer are within the scope of the drawings and annotations on the amended plan ref. No. 02_16/ SK01 and subject to the approval by the NPA of satisfactory details, the character and appearance of the dwelling, the terrace as a whole and the conservation area would be preserved. On this basis there would be no harmful conflict with Policies DP3, HE.4, & HE.5 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and Section 12: 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. (I am minded to accept the appellants' view that Policies CP7, CP19 & CP20 of the Winchester

District Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy 2013 also cited in the Notice of Refusal are either of little or no relevance to my Decision).

11. I shall therefore allow the appeal, subject to a condition requiring the details of the proposal pursuant to Drawing No. No. 02_16/ SK01 to be submitted for the NPA's agreement. I recognise that the appellants will need to reach a consensus with the NPA on these details, but the alternative is for me to dismiss the appeal, as the sketch drawing contains insufficient details for the standard 'compliance with plans' condition.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR