



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/17/3180142

54 Lower Northam Road, Hedge End SO30 4FQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Shelagh Hare against Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref F/17/80388, is dated 11 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two storey rear extension and front dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a two storey rear extension and front dormer is refused.

Procedural Matters and Main Issues

2. The Council has submitted that had it been in the position to determine the application it would have refused permission for reasons relating to the development's effect on: the character and appearance of 54 Lower Northam Road (No 54) and the area; and the living conditions of the occupiers of 52 Lower Northam Road (No 52), with particular regard to outlook. I have treated the Council's putative reasons for refusal as the basis for identifying the main issues for the determination of this appeal.
3. The Council has cited potential conflict with Policy DM1 of its emerging Local Plan. However, no information about the emerging Local Plan's preparation has been provided. On the evidence available to me I consider that very little weight should be attached to the emerging Local Plan for the purposes of the determination of this appeal.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. No 54 is a two bedroom bungalow, with a square floor plan and a fully hipped roof. This property is situated at the eastern extremity of a run of similarly designed bungalows, albeit a number of the other bungalows have had side dormers and/or rear extensions.
5. The development would involve the construction of a 7.08 metre deep rear extension with a nearly full width rear dormer. The development would also include the insertion of a front dormer, while parts of the new first floor accommodation would be illuminated by rooflights. The extended property would become a four bedroom chalet bungalow. While the rear extension has

been described as being two storeys in height I consider it should be more accurately referred to as being a single storey extension with first floor accommodation.

6. The existing bungalow is of quite modest proportions and the rear extension would nearly double No 54's depth. No 54 has a quite simple form and I consider that because of the depth and scale of the rear extension that that simplicity would be lost, with the addition being of disproportionate proportions. The proposed rear dormer would be of a quite unusual squat form because of its excessive width relative to its height. I consider that in combination the rear alterations would be unsympathetic of No 54's character and appearance. I also consider the incongruity of the rear alterations would be accentuated by the inclusion of a part dummy pitched roof, with that element of the development being indicative of the rear additions being excessive in scale.
7. While the rear alterations would be harmful to the appearance of No 54, they would not be readily apparent in the streetscene. I therefore consider that the rear alterations would not be harmful to character and appearance of the wider streetscene.
8. The front dormer would have a hipped roof and it would be of modest proportions. While front dormers are uncharacteristic of Lower Northam Road's streetscene, I consider that the scale and appearance of this addition would neither harm the appearance of No 54 nor the wider streetscene.
9. I conclude that the rear development would be harmful to the character and appearance of No 54. That aspect of the development would be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review of 2006 (the Local Plan) and the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document of 2011 (the SPD). That is because the development would be of an unacceptable scale and design.

Living Conditions

10. The rear extension would project a significant way beyond No 52's rear elevation. I consider the extension's depth and bulk would be excessive and that the resulting enclosure of No 52's external space would be harmful to the living conditions for this property's occupiers. I also consider that the rear extension's presence would result in some loss of outlook from within No 52's interior.
11. I therefore conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 52. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and the SPD because it would unduly interfere with the outlook from an adjoining dwelling.

Other Matter

12. Reference has been made to the significant alterations that have been made to No 44. However, few details of the works to No 44 have been made available to me and I therefore do not know how comparable the circumstances that gave rise to that development are with the scheme before me. Notwithstanding that I am required to consider the appeal development on its individual merits and that is what I have done.

Conclusions

13. I have concluded that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of No 54 and the living conditions of the occupiers of No 52. That being harm that could not be overcome by the imposition of reasonable conditions. The appeal is therefore dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR