
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2021

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J1725/D/21/3267035
13 Park Close, Gosport PO12 3EA

- 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 Sarah Chamberlain against the decision of Gosport Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref 20/00385/FULL, dated 5 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of hip to gable extension and erection of dormer extensions on the front and rear roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the appeal form and decision notice, since it more accurately describes the proposal than that of the application form. I have omitted the words '*resubmission of 20/00001/FULL*', since this does not form part of the proposed development.
3. The Council's delegated report confirms that the Council's view is that the proposed hip to gable extension and rear dormer comprise permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO), and that this is a fall-back position relevant to the consideration of the appeal proposal.
4. I have no evidence before me that a formal application for a certificate of lawfulness with respect to these elements of the appeal scheme has been determined by the Council, and the determination of what could potentially be built under permitted development rights is not a matter for me to decide within the context of an appeal made under Section 78 of the Act. Accordingly, I am required to determine the appeal on the basis of the scheme before me, which includes consideration of the hip to gable extension and the rear dormer.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property comprises a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling, located on the south side of Park Close, within an established residential area. The street comprises a series of similarly-designed two-storey terraces, positioned on a straight, regular front building line, with houses sited close to the road behind low front boundary walls. As such, the roofscape is visually prominent within the street scene. Terraces of houses which are similarly designed are a feature of the wider locality, including within Hill Park Road and Virginia Park Road, which act as the approach roads to Park Close.
7. The appeal property has rendered and painted brick walls under a tiled, hipped roof, with a front gable feature above projecting bay windows. The roof comprises an integral part of the street-facing roofscape of the terraces in Park Close, which have a strong regular rhythm of design, incorporating pairs of front gable projections, and decorative features such as potted brick chimneys, and ridge, edge and property-dividing coping roof tiles. The uncluttered and uniform nature of the roofscape makes a positive contribution to the street scene.
8. The rear roofs of the housing terraces have a similarly consistent design, with slopes that are less cluttered than at the front, due to a lack of rear gable projections. This roofscape is evident in views from the service lane which runs along the rear of the housing.
9. The proposed extension to the side of the roof to create a gable end would result in a bulky and discordant addition to the end of the terrace, which would be out of keeping with the prevalent hipped roof design within the street, and which would unbalance the appearance of the roofscape and terrace as a whole.
10. The proposed front dormer would occupy a considerable amount of the front roof slope, and would dominate this part of the roof due to its width and height, and position of its roof very close to the main roof ridge. The flat-roofed design would not respect the traditional hipped roof construction of the original property. The proposed siting of the dormer close to the existing chimney and front gable projection, combined with its proposed height, width and depth, would result in a cramped and over-dominant addition, which would overwhelm these existing positive roof features. The incongruous appearance of the dormer would be exacerbated by the non-alignment of its glazed element with the ground and first floor windows below.
11. The proposed front dormer would appear as a bulky, top-heavy and discordant addition to the front roof slope, which is highly visible in the street scene, drawing the eye, and appearing at odds with the aforementioned consistent roofscape which is characteristic of the street. In this respect, the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the area when viewed from the public realm of the street.
12. The proposed flat-roofed rear dormer would occupy an even larger part of the roof slope than the front dormer, extending close to the roof ridge and eaves and almost across the entire width of the roof slope. Whilst not impacting on the street scene in the same way as the front dormer, it would be visible from the rear service lane, and would impact on the character and appearance of the host property, raising similar concerns in respect of flat roofed design and dormer width, depth and position within the roof slope as the front dormer. The proposed small areas of dormer fenestration, set high into the rear wall of the

dormer, leaving a large area of blank rear dormer wall, would serve to draw attention to the discordant and disproportionately large addition to the rear of the roof, which would not respect the character and appearance of the rear elevation of the property.

13. The appellant has drawn my attention to existing front and rear dormers in nearby streets. I am not aware of the particular circumstances relating to their planning status, and it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these or otherwise. In any event, the fact that apparently similar dormers may have been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual planning merits, and within the context of the character and appearance of the existing building and the immediate locality, including the lack of existing dormers within Park Close. As such, the existence of other such dormers in the area does not justify the harm that I have found for the reasons set out above.
14. Nor would the harm that I have identified be outweighed or justified by the lack of objection from neighbours, or the intention of neighbours to carry out a similar form of development, should the appeal be allowed.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy LP10 of the *Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029* (2015), which, amongst other things, requires new development to be well-designed, and to have a high quality appearance in terms of scale, setting, layout, massing and appearance.
16. For similar reasons, the proposal would also be contrary to Chapter 12 of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2019* (the Framework) which requires high quality design.

Other Matters

17. Whilst I have given careful consideration to the appellant's need to extend the appeal property to provide more practical family living space, 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 Local Plan and the Framework.
18. Notwithstanding the Government's programme of changes to the planning system to help the country "build, build, build", I must determine this appeal within the context of the refused planning application.

Conclusion

19. 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?'

