

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/17/3175262

3 Seacroft Avenue, Barton-On-Sea BH25 7NY

- 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 P Currie against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/11742 was refused by notice dated 22 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is to replace existing pitched roof with new (ridge raised above existing height), convert loft space, install rooflights and construct side roof dormers. Juliette balcony to new rear upstairs bedroom. Single storey extension to rear of dwelling at ground floor level plus build new single garage to west side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to replace existing pitched roof with new (ridge raised above existing height), convert loft space, install rooflights and construct side roof dormers. Juliette balcony to new rear upstairs bedroom. Single storey extension to rear of dwelling at ground floor level plus build new single garage to west side, at 3 Seacroft Avenue, Barton-On-Sea BH25 7NY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/11742, 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: 1115.01/01 revision a, 1115.01/02, 1115.01/03, 1115.01/05 and 1115.01/06.
 - 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.
 - 4) Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the window in the dormer addition to the east facing side elevation serving an en-suite bathroom shall be installed with obscured glass and with any opening being at a minimum height of 1.7m above internal floor level. The window shall thereafter be retained in accordance with these details.
 - 5) Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the rooflights in the east facing side elevation shall be installed so as to be non-opening and fitted with obscured glass and thereafter be retained as such.
 - 6) The flat roof area of the single storey rear extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.
-

Main issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:

- The effect on the character and appearance of the locality and the streetscene.
- The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings with regard to overlooking, daylight, sunlight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal concerns a detached bungalow with a hipped roof that is located towards the eastern end of Seacroft Avenue. The Council's New Milton Local Distinctiveness Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) places the appeal site within Character Area 9, the Barton Gardens area. In this area the consistency of roof forms is said to be particularly important, with hipped roof bungalows being specifically referred to. It is advised that in bungalow areas eaves lines and roof slopes should be repeated.
4. Although Seacroft Avenue is characterised by hipped roof bungalows, the immediately adjacent dwelling at no. 1 is a relatively large chalet style dwelling with cropped gable ends to the sides. It also has fairly large flat roof dormers and is noticeably wider than other properties with a relatively long ridge parallel to the street. The hipped roof bungalow at no. 5 is similar in form to no. 3. However, those at 7 and 9 differ as they have gable ended front projections from the main hipped roof, giving a more complex form. There are also other dwellings in the street with such features. The dwelling on the opposite side of the road at no. 6 also has a gable ended front elevation.
5. The proposed front gable would reflect the gable features nearby on the same side of the street as well as the immediately adjacent cropped side gable to the east, therefore being compatible with the immediate surroundings. The area of sloping roof below the new front gable would also make reference to the hipped roofs in the street.
6. The Inspector in the appeal decision concerning 22 Seacroft Avenue (Ref APP/B1740/D/12/2186261) referred to evidence that the roof heights of bungalows in the street is varied. That was my impression at the site visit and I also saw that the immediately neighbouring dwelling to the east at 1 Seacroft Avenue has a higher ridge height than the host dwelling. The approved drawings for the alterations to the property at no. 6 Seacroft Avenue show it having a ridge height about 0.35m higher than those to either side. In consequence, the proposed higher ridge height of about half a metre would not be unduly out of line with the variation found in the street.
7. The new main roof would have greater bulk, due to the front gable and rear cropped gable, than that to be replaced. It would also have an appreciably longer ridge. However, ridge lengths and the overall size and bulk of roofs vary significantly in the street and those of the new roof would not be excessive in this context. Moreover, views of the roof as a whole from the street in Seacroft Avenue would tend to be relatively oblique, significantly limiting the impression of its overall length and bulk. There would not be any significant

increase in footprint and the enlarged dwelling would not be overly dominant within its plot. The garage and dormer additions would reflect such features at other properties in the street.

8. In these circumstances the enlarged dwelling would not appear overly bulky and incongruous despite the greater size, height and design of the new roof. It is therefore concluded that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the locality or the streetscene.
9. The development would contribute positively to local distinctiveness, while also being appropriate and sympathetic to its setting and well designed, in accordance with these aims of New Forest District, outside the National Park, Core Strategy (CS), Adopted October 2009, Policy CS2.
10. The proposed development would retain the low eaves level. While not repeating the hipped roofs in the vicinity it would repeat the nearby gables. Moreover, in its precise context the proposal would have no detrimental effect in relation to the pattern and consistency of roof forms, with the underlying aim of the SPD not being compromised.
11. The core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) that planning should seek to secure high quality design and take account of the character of different areas would be satisfied.

Living conditions

12. The first floor rear bedroom window would face directly down the garden so that any overlooking of 42 Sea Road to the side would be at a fairly acute angle with no undue loss of privacy. I acknowledge the concern that the flat roof next to this 'Juliette balcony' could be used as an outdoor amenity space from where undue overlooking would occur. However, a condition could be imposed preventing such use were the appeal to succeed.
13. The rooflights in the east facing side elevation could be the subject of a condition requiring them to be glazed with obscured glass and be non-opening. The window in the dormer addition in the same flank could also be required to have obscured glazing and restricted opening. Unacceptable loss of privacy from overlooking at 1 Seacroft Avenue and 42 Sea Road could therefore be avoided by the use of conditions.
14. As the Council points out, the west facing dormer addition would overlook the drive of no. 5 Seacroft Avenue with there being no adverse impact so that a condition in relation to this window is not needed.
15. Matters such as the distance from the adjacent dwellings, together with the fairly low eaves level and slope of the roof down towards them, would prevent any undue loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook at the properties to the east. The flank to flank relationship, gap to the boundary and the slope of the new roof would prevent any detrimental effect in relation to the dwelling at 5 Seacroft Avenue.
16. Due to these factors, it is concluded that the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings would not be harmed and it is noted that the Council has raised no objections in this respect. As a result, there would be compliance with the intention of CS Policy CS2 to prevent such detrimental effects.

Other consideration

17.As the proposal would include a new garage with space to the front, the Council has raised no objections in relation to car parking and I see no reason to take a different view.

Conclusion

18.Taking account of all other matters raised, there is no reason to reject the proposal given the absence of harm and the appeal succeeds. In reaching this decision I have considered the views of neighbouring residents and the Town Council.

Conditions

19.In addition to those referred to above, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. The facing materials used should match those of the existing dwelling to protect its appearance.

M Evans

INSPECTOR