
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2017

by Ken Barton BSc(Hons) DipArch DipArb RIBA FCI Arb

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

Decision date: 7th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/17/3171378

Pembroke Cottage, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton SO24 0AA

- 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 Mark Arscott against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02509/HOU, dated 28 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is to regularise the design of a rear extension and roof raise to provide a loft extension.
-

Application for costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mr Mark Arscott against Winchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission was granted on 10 December 2015, Ref 15/02373/FUL, for a rear extension and roof raise to provide a loft conversion and development was undertaken. The appeal statement notes that some design changes were made during the construction and identified by the Council as deviating from the drawings. A retrospective application was submitted to regularise the situation but this was dismissed by the Council leading to this appeal. The appellant accepts that "some design changes were made during the construction period" but maintains that these are "very close in style and size to the previous application".
3. The Council highlights a number of discrepancies between the development as built and the drawings, which I acknowledge. However, the Officer's assessment states that it is based on the scheme as built. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the development as carried out on site rather than any of the drawings.
4. A retrospective application for the installation of 14 solar panels was dismissed at appeal on 8 September 2016 but was determined on its own merits and is not relevant to this case.

Decision

5. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear extension and roof raise to provide a loft extension at Pembroke Cottage, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton SO24 0AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02509/HOU, dated 28 September 2016 and the development as carried out.

Effect on the Character and Appearance of the Surrounding Area

6. Pembroke Cottage lies to the rear of a lay-by on the south side of the main road through Bishop's Sutton. Whilst the building is visible when travelling either way along the road, it is not particularly prominent in the street scene. The village consists of houses of various ages, sizes, design, and materials. The appeal building is not listed, and does not lie within a conservation area or a national park.
7. The drawings submitted to date do not accurately portray the Cottage as extended, although the drawings are not dimensioned and no measurements were required by condition. The Council's measurements indicate that the discrepancies are relatively small, the height to the ridge is 0.25 metres higher than the 8.55 metres shown on the drawings, whilst the height to the rear eaves is also 0.25 metres more than the 6.35 metres on the drawing. The height to the front eaves is some 0.2 metres higher than scaled from the drawings. In addition, the positioning and size of the rear and side windows differs from the drawings and the front dormer is slightly larger.
8. The approved scheme envisaged an increase of 1.25 metres in height but the cottage has been altered increasing the height by roughly 1.5 metres. The front dormers are 0.3 metres higher than on the drawings and are 2.05 metres wide rather than 2.4 metres. The rear velux type windows extend further up the roof and are also higher up the elevation. New windows at the rear are also shown inaccurately but the Council does not consider that they would justify another reason for refusal. I concur with this view.
9. The Council maintains that the tiles do not comply with those conditioned as part of the original scheme being a different colour, texture and lay. However, surrounding properties utilize a range of materials including concrete tiles. The clay tiles used appear 'new' which to some extent highlights the raised roof. However, in time, the extended cottage would weather in and the roof would not appear any more prominent than other roofing materials in the vicinity.
10. Whatever the reason(s) for the discrepancies, the cumulative impact on the overall perception of the size and bulk of the cottage is insignificant. The altered and extended building would still sit comfortably within the varied character and appearance of the settlement, in accordance with the aims of policies DP.3 ii) and CE.23 i) of the *Winchester District Local Plan Review* (2006), Policies DM16 i) and vi) and DM23 of the *Winchester District Local Plan Part 2* (2017) and the advice in the Council's *High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document*.

Other Matters

11. The window to the stairs on the east elevation has caused some concern to the occupiers of Darroford House in terms of overlooking. However, the modest increase in the size of the window, and the nature of the space served, would preclude any significant increase in overlooking and would not warrant dismissing this appeal. I note the concern about the effect on house prices but this is not generally a planning consideration.

Conditions

12. The development has been implemented and the Council does not suggest that any conditions need to be attached. I see no reason to reach a different conclusion.

Ken Barton

Inspector