
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2020

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/20/3247558

Magnolia, Hensting Lane, Owslebury, Winchester SO21 1LE

- 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 Steven Winter against the decision of the South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application ref SDNP/19/03922/HOUS, dated 11 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to existing flat roof dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side extension to existing flat roof dormer at Magnolia, Hensting Lane, Owslebury, Winchester SO21 1LE in accordance with the terms of the application SDNP/19/03922/HOUS, dated 11 August 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the landscape, in terms of its size and design.

Procedural Matter

3. The dormer extension is already built. I am required to determine the appeal based on the development shown on the submitted plans. It appears that the plans accurately reflect what has been built and I have proceeded on that basis.

Reasons

Size

4. Policy SD31 of the South Downs Local Plan limits extensions to existing dwellings to an approximately 30% increase in floorspace. 'Existing' means the dwelling as it stood in 2002.
5. There is disagreement between the main parties on the extent of the cumulative enlargement of the dwelling. Referring to the photographic evidence submitted by the appellant both the single storey side extension and the rear box dormer are present on all three aerial photos, the earliest of which dates from 1999. In the absence of any contrary evidence, I conclude that these form part of the 'existing' building for the purposes of Policy SD31.

6. The permission granted in 2005 for two small front dormers and one small side dormer does not appear to have been implemented. The rear box dormer was already in existence before this permission was granted and did not form part of that scheme. The plans submitted with the 2005 application show the extent of the first floor already being used for domestic accommodation.
7. Using the existing floorspace figures given in the appellant's appeal statement of 260m², and the dormer extension floorspace of 28m² based on the dimensions given on the submitted plans, the proportionate increase in floorspace is some 11%. Even if the appellant's existing floorspace figure is reduced to omit attic space outside that used for living accommodation, the proportionate increase in floorspace is still significantly less than 30%. The dormer extension does not therefore conflict with Policy SD31, whose purpose is to avoid the over-extension of existing dwellings and the adverse impact this has on the character and appearance of the countryside.

Design

8. The dormer extension is not well designed because of its size and shape, which departs from the pitched roof form of the existing dwelling. However, its impact on the character and appearance of the landscape is very limited. The only public view of it is gained from Hensting Lane where it is seen in side profile without the greater part of its bulk or design being apparent. Oblique views are obscured by a large outbuilding along the edge of the lane, and it is screened in medium and long distance views by trees and hedges along the verges of the lane and by an agricultural building at the rear of the site. Because of the degree of containment from the adjacent buildings, trees and hedges, the dormer extension does not have a significant impact on the wider landscape.
9. The site lies within the South Downs National Park, in which great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. Notwithstanding its less than ideal design, because the impact on the wider landscape character is so limited, in my view the dormer extension does not harm the character and appearance of the landscape and therefore does not conflict with policies SD4 and SD5 of the South Downs Local Plan, which seek to protect landscape character.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. As the development is already built, this condition is unnecessary. For the same reason there is no need to impose a time limit condition or a condition requiring matching materials as suggested in the appeal questionnaire.

Conclusion

11. I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR