
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020

by Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/20/3250586

21 Old Kennels Lane, Olivers Battery SO22 4JP

- 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 Derek Smith against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02565/HOU, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Old Kennels Lane in the vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by mainly detached single-storey and one-and-a-half storey dwellings. The site is located on the south-east side of Old Kennels Lane and the appeal property is a single-storey property. Thus, the host building positively contributes to the appearance of the built form in the immediate surrounding area. By contrast, the proposed development would introduce a central two-storey element, which would result in a property at odds with the prevailing character of dwellings in the immediate surrounding area which are in general low in profile.
4. The existing property is of a simple traditional form with a pitched roof and a single-storey front projection. The Council's 'High Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document, 2015 (SPD) states, amongst other things, that extensions should be sensitively related to the existing building, and the character of the area. The proposed first-floor extension would incorporate an asymmetrical pitched roof to the front and back along with an additional mansard roof element to the side. By virtue of its design and scale the development would represent an incongruous addition failing to respect the somewhat simple form of the host building. The proposed substantial first floor extension would appear as a discordant feature, projecting centrally above the existing pitched roof and so not relate sensitively to the existing building.
5. Overall, the design of the proposal would appear an awkward and strange form of development. Although the host building is set back from the road frontage, the incoherent design and massing at first floor level would be conspicuous and

jarring when viewed from the street. Consequently, the development would upset the overall balanced appearance of the lower profiled properties in the immediate surrounding area and in doing so have a significant adverse influence on the street-scene.

6. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently, in this regard, the proposal would conflict with Policy CP13 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy, March 2013 and Policies DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, April 2017 (LPP2). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure development meets the highest standards of design; responds positively to the character and appearance of the local environment, within and surrounding the site, in terms of design and scale; and respects the qualities, features and characteristics that contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area. The proposed development would also not accord with the SPD insofar as it would not relate sensitively to the host building and the character of the area. The Council has referred to Policy DM17 of the LPP2 in their refusal notice. However, this policy is not directly relevant to character and appearance issues.

Other Matters

7. The appellant refers to other developments in the surrounding area and specifically to the extensions, alterations and design of these other properties. Whilst I am not aware of the full circumstances which led to these other developments being granted planning permission, based on the information before me and what I saw at the time of my site visit, most of them do not appear to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
8. The properties in Olivers Battery Road South are not within the same context as the appeal site given that they are some distance away and not in the same road as the appeal site and hence it cannot be said that the character and appearance context is identical.
9. Similarly, the property at No 2 Old Kennels Lane, although part two-storey, is close to the junction with Olivers Battery Road South where, to the north of the junction there are two-storey properties, so it cannot be said that the character and appearance context is the same.
10. Nos 6, 14, 15, 19, 31 and 36 Old Kennels Lane and No 13 Braeside Close would all appear to be either one-and-a-half storey properties or part single-storey part one-and-a-half storey properties. I acknowledge that Nos 16 to 22 Old Kennels Lane all have large angular white roofs and facias, however they would all appear to be single-storey properties. I saw at the time of my site visit that No 29 Old Kennels Lane has recently undergone alterations. Although substantial, it would also appear to be a part single-storey part one-and-a-half storey property. Consequently, all these properties are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal insofar as none would appear to be part two-storey dwellings.
11. The appellant says that possibly the largest conversion of a property is at No 44 Old Kennels Lane. However, whilst I note this development, its existence does not justify the harm that I have identified in character and appearance terms and in particular the harm that would be caused to the host

building and immediate surrounding area if planning permission were to be approved.

12. In any event, I have determined the appeal proposal based on the circumstances of the site, on the evidence before me and on its individual planning merits. None of the other matters raised alter or outweigh my overall conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR