
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/19/3237590
24 Bursledon Road, Hedge End SO30 0BW

- 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 Ms B Kiernan against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/19/85625, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'replacement roof with rooms in'.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house which has undergone a range of alterations and extensions. Consequently, despite the adjoining dwelling being relatively unaltered, there is little symmetry remaining between the pair. Nonetheless, the properties retain comparable scales and proportions through the consistency in their heights, the width of their original, and legible frontages and their matching shallow hipped roofs.
4. The existing extensions to the host building include side and rear additions, with flat roof forms. The existing two-storey side extension is nominally set-back from the front elevation and although long, has an unobtrusive appearance due to its limited height. On approaches from the south this elevation is clearly visible due to the deeply recessed siting of no 26, which has a largely open frontage.
5. The proposal would obviate the existing hipped and flat roofs of 24 Bursledon Road with a steeply pitched, gable-fronted roof that would facilitate additional habitable rooms. Additionally, the plans show a gable detail to the south elevation to accommodate access stairs, and a further addition to the north roof slope. Whilst these details add some variety they also add to the mass and scale of the building. Furthermore, they would create a cluttered and contrived appearance relating poorly to the adjoining roof form.

6. The proposal would increase the overall height, scale and mass of the built form at the second-floor level commensurate with an additional storey. The combination of the steep pitch and form would appear incongruous in the context of the modest, two-storey scale of the existing host building and the adjoining property at no 22. These two properties continue to read together within the street scene due to their physical attachment, proximity and scale. The proposed roof alterations, including the front gable end, would dominate and appear at odds with the shallow pitch and hipped form of the neighbour.
7. The additional mass, bulk and form would be clearly legible from the north over the roof of no 22. Furthermore, it would be prominent within the street scene on approaches from the south, appearing as a dominant mass and bulk which unlike the existing flat roof, would fail to mitigate the substantial depth of the existing two-storey extensions to the side and rear of the appeal property.
8. Residential properties within the area, which is not subject of any special planning designations, exhibit a range of scales and designs. However, neither this, or the lack of additional footprint mitigate the harm. Development proposals should be sympathetic to the surrounding built form and take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of any area. The proposal would not achieve this.
9. Therefore, on the main issue I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. As such the proposal would conflict with 'saved' Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) – Adopted May 2006, Policy DM1 of the emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 – dated June 2018, Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document – Adopted November 2011. These policies and guidance, amongst other aims, seek high quality design that is appropriate in mass, scale and design.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR