



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/20/3264690

18 Verona Road, Chandler's Ford SO53 2BZ

- 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 Mrs Dawn Felton against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/20/88683, dated 4 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is increase of roof ridge height, rear dormers and front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above is taken from the appeal form and decision notice, since it more accurately describes the proposal than the description on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a modest detached bungalow of traditional design, with facing brick walls under a tiled pitched roof. It has been extended from its original form, and there are two gable-ended projections to the rear of the building.
5. The site is located within a suburban residential area. Verona Road and neighbouring roads are characterised by detached, low-level bungalows. They are generally set back behind front gardens which are defined by low front boundary walls. As such, the area has a pleasant open nature, and dwellings are highly visible within the street scene. Although there are a variety of dwelling designs and roof forms, there is, nonetheless, a consistency within the townscape in that properties have generally retained their original simple uncluttered roof forms and original ridge heights.
6. The appeal proposal would appear incongruous within this established townscape. The proposed increase in ridge height would be out of keeping with the row of properties within which the appeal property lies, disrupting the

regularity of roof ridge heights. This would be particularly evident in relation to the adjacent property at No.20, which has an almost identical pitched roof design and front gabled projection as the appeal property, and is sited on a similar ground level and building line in relation to the street.

7. The discordant impact of the proposal within the street scene would be exacerbated by the proposed additional mass of roof arising from the rear dormer additions, the easternmost of which would be apparent from the public realm when approaching the site from the southeast along Verona Road. In this view, the rear dormer would appear unduly bulky due to its combined height and depth, as it would extend from eaves level to almost the height of the elevated roof ridge.
8. The proposed rear dormers would relate poorly to the roof slopes within which they would be positioned, and would occupy a considerable part of the rear slope of the main roof. They would replace the smaller of the existing pitched roof projections with a higher and more square-shaped flat-roofed enlargement, which would not reflect the original building character. They would also add massing and height to the roof of the larger of the existing rear projections, with a structure that would rise above the ridge height of this subsidiary structure and sit awkwardly in relation to the existing roof form.
9. The resulting top-heavy and unsympathetic appearance of the rear dormers arising from their combined scale, mass and height, would be accentuated by the large size and square proportions of the proposed dormer glazing in relation to the shallower and more horizontal design of the window below, thereby serving to draw more attention to the dormer.
10. Whilst views of the rear dormers from the street would be restricted to a small section of Verona Road and limited views between properties to the rear in Tuscan Walk, they would, however, be evident in views from the appeal site, and from neighbouring properties and their gardens. From these locations they would be viewed as bulky and discordant additions to the rear roof slope, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the wider area.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would not accord with Saved Policy 59.BE of the *Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001 – 2011* (2009) and Emerging Policy DM1 of the Submitted *Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036)* (2018). These policies, amongst other things, require new developments to be of a good design, take full and proper account of the context of the site, including the character and appearance of the locality, and to be appropriate in mass, scale, design and siting in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings and spaces.
12. For similar reasons, the development would not accord with guidance in Chapter 12 of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2019* (the Framework), which requires high quality design.

Other Matters

13. I have given careful consideration to the appellant's requirements for additional living accommodation within the appeal property to provide more living space to accommodate an additional family member. However, I am not persuaded

by the evidence before me that the proposed design is necessary to achieve the required accommodation. Also, I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance¹ that, in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is also probable that the proposed development would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material. For these reasons, I therefore find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused contrary to the development plan and the Framework.

14. The appellant has drawn my attention to other flat-roofed dormers within the vicinity of the appeal site, which are publicly visible within the townscape, including within Tuscan Walk. I saw, during my site inspection, that these differ from the appeal proposal in respect of their design, size and position in relation to the roof slopes within which they sit, and I am not aware of the particular circumstances of these cases. In any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits and in relation to the context of the appeal site. The existence of other flat-roofed dormers in the area does not justify the harm I have identified.
15. My attention has been drawn to the lack of objection to the proposal from neighbours to the sides and rear of the site. However, this does not alter my findings in respect of the current proposal. Neither does the fact that the scheme represents an amended scheme from that which was the subject of pre-application advice, including the removal of previously proposed double doors, since I must determine the appeal on the merits of the current scheme.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph 008 Reference ID 21b-008-20140306 – ‘What is a material planning consideration?’