



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2019

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/19/3230793

20 Victory Avenue, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO8 9PH.

- 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 & Mrs D Periera against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application ref: 52222/001, dated 23 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as: "Extension to existing loft."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft extension and roof over front porch at 20 Victory Avenue, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO8 9PH, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 52222/001, dated 23 January 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01/19/VA-01; 01/19/VA-02; 01/19/VA-07; 01/19/VA-08; MR - All E1 13; MR - All E2 14; Location Plan; Block Plan.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. Part E of the appeal form states that the description of development has not changed. Nevertheless, a different wording has been entered, which is identical to that used by the Council. Given that the Council's description of development more accurately reflects the scheme before me, I have used it in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue here is the effect of the loft extension upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 20 Victory Avenue comprises a detached, inter-war bungalow that contains accommodation within the roof space. Given the slope of the original roof, the two front bedrooms upstairs have restricted headroom. The scheme before me seeks to replace the existing sloping front roof with a gable end arrangement. In addition, a small porch roof would be provided above the front door.
5. The Officer's Report accepts that the small porch roof is of a modest size that would easily assimilate with the host dwelling. I agree with that assessment, such that my decision relates solely to a consideration of the alterations that are required to extend the roof accommodation.
6. Chapter 12 of the Framework¹ sets out the need for sustainable development to be well designed and sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.
7. Policy CP29 of the LP Joint Core Strategy² requires all new development to be appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of its scale, height, massing and density and its relationship to adjoining buildings. "Saved" Policy HE2 of the DLP³ requires alterations and extensions to buildings to be designed to take account of the design, scale and character of the original building, its plot size and its setting. The roof form of any extension or alteration should respect the form of the original building.
8. The works to create a gable end would leave the small feature front projection untouched. The new structure would be sited on top of the main front elevation and would replace the existing sloping section of roof with a wall in matching materials and incorporating a double feature window to serve each of the two front bedrooms.
9. The Council has expressed concerns as to the introduction of a gable end and the unusual window design. I am nevertheless satisfied that the front gable end, which would be constructed in matching materials, would not have any unacceptable impact upon the host building. The feature window is also of an innovative design that would be subservient within the overall size of the new front wall.
10. During my site visit I noted that several of the adjoining bungalows have been the subject of alterations, including dormer windows to their front roof slopes. By reference to the wider area there are modern detached houses opposite the appeal site, whilst the bungalows at the junction of Victory Avenue and Bulls Copse Lane (25 and 27 Victory Avenue) both have gable ends, that to no. 25 being particularly visible in the street scene.
11. For all of these reasons I have found upon the main issue that development as proposed would have a satisfactory relationship with and not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or that of the surrounding area and that it would accord with the objectives of both national and Development Plan policy as detailed above.

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).

² The East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (adopted 8 May 2014).

³ The East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (March 2006).

Conditions

12. I have considered the three conditions put forward by the Council against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Planning Practice Guidance. I find all to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case, my reasons for them being:
13. Condition 1 is the standard commencement condition imposed in accordance with section 91(1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Condition 2 will ensure a satisfactory appearance to the completed development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area while Condition 3, which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, provides certainty.

Conclusion

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

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR