

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2017

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/17/3168248

17 Collins Lane, Hursley, Winchester, Hampshire SO21 2JX

- 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 Chris and Mrs Laura Leech against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02064, dated 19 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached garage, alterations and extensions to existing property to include raising the ridge to form first floor accommodation, 2-storey side and rear extensions and single storey rear extension to include integral garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed alterations and extensions on the character and appearance of the area including on the setting of the Hursley Conservation Area and on the living conditions of neighbours at 12 Heathcote Place and 60 Collins Lane.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 3-bedroom bungalow of modest proportions just to the east of the Conservation Area. It lies on a site just as the land starts to rise to the north and east of the village. Immediately to the north is a courtyard of garages and 12 Heathcote Place, a two-storey detached house. To the east is 60 Collins Lane, another detached two-storey house. To the south is a track and public right of way (PROW) coming from the south-east, on higher ground before dropping down to the road opposite No 17.
 4. The bungalow is set back from the road but the proposed alterations and extensions would add a considerable volume to the existing low-key dwelling, which fits in well with its surroundings. The roof would be markedly increased in height to accommodate the new first and attic floors and two 2-storey gable features would be provided to the front elevation.
 5. Whilst there is a high hedge to the frontage the increase in height and bulk would be very noticeable from the PROW opposite. The front elevation would
-

have large round headed first floor windows, out of scale with those proposed on the ground floor, and this design would be repeated on the eastern elevation. At the same time there would be a double garage door to the westerly gable extension and large rooflights to the loft/attic floor on the front elevation. These design features would not, in my view, meld well together. They would comprise an assortment of jarring styles and sizes, some traditional and some modern exacerbating the large increase in bulk of the building, which would bear no resemblance to its existing form.

6. The predominance of windows on the eastern elevation, presumably designed as such to prevent overlooking of 12 Heathcote Place by minimising windows to the rear, would give the building an odd dual-frontaged appearance alien to the dwellings around it.
7. Due to the curve of Collins Lane at this point and the fact that the bungalow is set back from it the enlarged dwelling would not be very noticeable from The Square. But looking west into the Conservation Area from the PROW the new building would be seen in the context of the more modest buildings in The Square; I consider its bulk and unfortunate design would adversely affect such views such that it would fail to preserve the setting of this part of the Conservation Area and hence its overall character and appearance.
8. The rear elevation of the westerly gable, which would extend very close to No 17's rear boundary, would be blank. Whilst I understand the reason for this it would clearly be seen from the garage court and its appearance would be at odds with the heavily fenestrated front and eastern elevations. Such an imbalanced design is indicative to me of the confines of the site and the fact that the proposals would essentially be an overdevelopment of it.
9. I acknowledge that the property is bordered by modern houses on three sides and that those to the north and east are on higher ground. But this site is an important one in the street scene of Collins Lane. At present the appeal property fits into it comfortably. But the vast increase in bulk and volume combined with what I consider to be a rather odd contrived appearance of the disparate elevations viewable from public places would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area including the eastern setting of the Hursley Conservation Area.
10. For these reasons the proposed development would fail to meet the requirements of Policies DP.3 and HE.4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review (LPR), Policy CP20 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 and Policies DM14 and DM15 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (LPPT2), which together require development to respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment, within and surrounding the site, in terms of its design, scale and layout and to protect the character and setting of Conservation Areas.

Living Conditions

11. Nos 12 Heathcote Place and 60 Collins Lane, the nearest affected houses, are both located on higher ground, No 60 considerably so. But because the bungalow is set back into its site it is close to No 12. No 12's garden rises up towards the boundary such that the considerable increase in height of the

appeal property's roof would have an overbearing impact on that garden and, to a lesser but still marked effect, on No 12's rear windows. This is because the appeal dwelling is located quite close and immediately to the south of No 12 such that sunlight to No 12, particularly its rear garden, would be likely to be significantly affected.

12. Three large first floor windows are proposed on the east elevation of the altered dwelling. Whilst the rear windows of No 60 are far enough away from this elevation the increase in height of the altered building would afford these large windows a clear view through the gappy boundary planting of No 60's private rear garden, which is only 12m away. I consider such overlooking, where there is presently none, would result in a significant loss of privacy for the occupiers of No 60.
13. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed alterations and extensions would significantly harm the living conditions of neighbours at 12 Heathcote Place and 60 Collins Lane. They would fail to comply with LPR Policy DP.3 and LPpt2 Policy DM16, which together require development not to have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining land, uses or property by reason of overlooking, overshadowing or by being overbearing.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR