



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/19/3236484

Corner Cottage, Hospital Road, Shirrell Heath SO32 2JR

- 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 and Mrs R Rainer against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01353/HOU, dated 19 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear and side extension at Corner Cottage, Hospital Road, Shirrell Heath SO32 2JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01353/HOU, dated 19 June 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan Area 5 HA dated 01/04/19, Site Location Plan Area 2 HA dated 01/04/19, Existing Plans & Elevations drawing Rainer 217.1 dated 03/07/19 and Proposed Plans & Elevations drawing Rainer 217.4 dated 03/07/19.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached cottage in a sizeable plot, set back from the public highway by a long drive. The appeal proposal would add an additional storey on an existing single storey element which would match the existing ridge height along the front elevation. A two-storey rear extension is also proposed which would extend from the side of the dwelling. This element would have a lower ridge height than the existing roofline. The extension would

be finished in a light render to match the host dwelling. The site benefits from an extant planning permission¹ for a similar sized proposal.

4. Policy DM23 of Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 Development Management and Site Allocations document (2017) states that domestic extensions should be proportionate in size to the existing dwelling and generally be subordinate to it. The Winchester City Council High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2015) states that subordination can be achieved through setting down the ridge, setting the extension back from the front elevation and using a visually recessive finishing material. Furthermore, extensions should be proportionate to the scale of the existing house.
5. The proposed extension over the existing single storey element would have the same ridge height as the host dwelling and would be in line with the front elevation. Whilst the SPD recommends that subservience can be achieved through the use of a lower ridge height or by setting back the extension, there is no policy justification which states this must be the case for all extensions. In this instance the scale of the proposal is such that would be proportionate to the scale of the existing dwelling. The proposal would be a relatively small increase in scale and mass compared to the host dwelling and therefore would not appear as an unsympathetic addition. The use of matching materials and fenestrations which reflect the host dwellings would be of a complementary design.
6. Furthermore, the proposed two storey rear and side extension has a lower ridge height than the existing building, and as such would clearly appear as a subordinate addition to the property. Therefore, when taking the extension as a whole, the scale and mass of the proposal would not result in the proposal being visually dominant when compared to the host dwelling. I therefore consider that the additions would be subservient to the property.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As such there would be no conflict with Policy DM23 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 Development Management and Site Allocations adopted April 2017 and the SPD. These seek, amongst other things, that development respects the rural character of the area and that domestic extensions are of a proportionate size.

Conditions

8. I attach a standard time limit condition and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. These are necessary to provide clarity and certainty. I have attached a condition requiring the use of matching materials in order to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR

¹ Council reference 19/00729/HOU