
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/19/3233443
12 Sherborne Court, Eastleigh SO50 4PB

- 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 Andrew West against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/19/85656, dated 13 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'second storey extension above double garage, kitchen and utility. Extension will contain 2 additional bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The host building is a 2-storey detached property. To the front and rear the property has dormer windows at the first-floor eaves level. The pitched garage roof slopes towards the front and wraps around to form a canopy over the entrance, creating a continuous eaves detail across much of the front elevation's ground floor. The host building is typical of the street scene, which is a cul-de-sac of very similar residential properties set behind open frontages.
4. I have noted some alterations and extensions within the street scene, but it is largely preserved as originally designed. The dormer windows form a particularly strong and notable design feature. The host building is clearly visible and positively contributes to the Sherborne Court street scene with its little altered appearance.
5. The proposed projecting gable would be a dominant feature on the host building drawing attention away from the dormers and obviating the ground floor eaves detail. It would appear as a bland and stark elevational mass. I consider that this would be deleterious to the host building's design. Whilst the proposal would not increase the footprint of the building and the first floor would not overhang the ground floor I do not find that these attributes mitigate the incongruous design.

6. I have observed a number of extensions at Sherborne Court and the adjacent Bosville. A few limited variations in design exist including the extensions at 1 Sherborne Court and 4 Bosville. No 1 has the same projecting gable proposed here, albeit the mass is broken up by a ground floor eaves feature. Moreover, No 1 is sited behind mature landscape features on the corner of Bosville and Sherborne Court, and performs a transitional function between the two street scenes. The Bosville street scene is characterised by a range of design approaches contrasting with the uniform design approach in Sherborne Court. Both 1 Sherborne Court and 4 Bosville are viewed in that more varied context. As such I do not consider that those alterations set any form of precedent for the development proposed. Furthermore, I note that the alterations to No 1 were approved some time ago. Since then the policy context has evolved, and greater emphasis is placed on good design.
7. The proposed development would be at odds with the intentionally uniform design approach within Sherborne Court. I consider that the street scene retains a strong sense of place through the uniform and little altered designs of the housing. The dormers are a significant attribute to this. I have no evidence to support the appellant's claim that their neighbours consider the dormers to be unsightly and a projecting gable more attractive. Moreover, for the reasons previously set out I find the proposal to be harmful.
8. Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) adopted May 2006 (LP) seeks to promote good design through development proposals taking full and proper account of the context of the site, and ensuring that they are of an appropriate design and scale of themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings. The emerging policy restates these aims at DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 dated June 2018 (replacement LP). Additionally, I am mindful of paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), with which the LP has conformity. This states that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Furthermore, I have considered, and given some weight to, the adopted guidance within the Eastleigh Borough Council Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This sets out that the most successful developments utilise the positive attributes of the site in their design and that this can provide greater distinctiveness. Furthermore, it sets out that in streets with very uniform roof design, significant alterations to the roof are generally unacceptable.
9. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed development would be incongruous and have a deleterious effect on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. The proposal would fail to accord with Policy 59.BE of the LP, emerging policy DM1 of the replacement LP, the Framework and the local guidance within the Council's SPD. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR