
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2019

by L McKay MA MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10TH September 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/19/3230923

6 Dean Villas, Knowle PO17 5LR

- 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 Jason Williams against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00669/HOU, dated 14 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Retrospective application for lantern light in roof space and other minor amendments (fenestration, porch and extended eaves at front)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. While the Council appears to be primarily concerned with the lantern light, it is clear from the application form that other amendments have been applied for in addition to this, namely amendments to the fenestration, porch and extended eaves at the front. The Council indicates that the appellant will be submitting a further application for changes to the rear extension and dormer, which go beyond those mentioned on the application form. Those are not before me however and I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis of the development described on the application form.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the lantern light, porch and extended eaves had been completed. The front door and garage door differed from that shown on the submitted plans however. Therefore, I have determined the appeal on the basis that only part of the development has already occurred.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The host property is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses and sits at the end of a row of properties with open fields on three sides. Both the host property and its attached neighbour have been extended to the side and rear. There are public footpaths to the side and rear of this row of houses.

6. Approaching the front of the property, the lantern light projects above the main ridge, introducing a discordant element into the street scene where otherwise only chimneys break the roof line. The contrast of the dark frame of the lantern light with the white framed windows on the front elevation exacerbates its visual impact. While there are darker windows and doors elsewhere on the host property, they are not seen directly with the lantern light, and in any case it is not clear whether they have been approved.
7. The public footpaths provide views over open fields to the rear of the host property and the rest of this row of dwellings. From these vantage points the host property appears slightly different to its neighbours because of the hipped roof on the extension. There are a variety of roof forms on the rear elevations of these properties however, so the hip does not stand out. In contrast, the lantern light is a prominent and incongruous feature due to its conspicuous, elevated position above the roof line. It is highly visible from the surrounding countryside and does not respond positively to the character and appearance of the host property or the character of the area.
8. Consequently, the lantern light harms the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with policies DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (adopted April 2017) (LPP2) which require, amongst other things, that developments respect the distinctiveness of the local area and respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment. There is also conflict with the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) which seeks to achieve good urban design.
9. Turning to the other elements of the appeal scheme: the design of the proposed fenestration would be in keeping with that of the original property and others in the vicinity and would be acceptable. The extended eaves at the front elevation are well screened by vegetation on the boundary and do not detract from the appearance of the host property. The porch is large but the proportions and roof form respect the host property. As such these elements respond positively to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
10. I therefore find no conflict with policies DM15 and DM16 of the LPP2 or the SPD in respect of the proposed fenestration or the porch and extended eaves at the front. Nevertheless, the acceptability of these elements of the scheme does not justify the harm resulting from the lantern light, which is unacceptable.

Other matters

11. I note the letters of support for the scheme provided by the appellant and the comments within these relating to solar panels. I also note the suggestion that future landscaping would reduce the impact of the lantern light, however as no landscaping is proposed I cannot give this any weight. I also acknowledge that the lantern light does not result in significant light spill and provides private benefits to the family. These factors do not however outweigh my above findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. While some elements of the appeal scheme are acceptable, they do not justify the harm resulting from the lantern light. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR