



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021

by Martin Small BA(Hons) BPI DipCM MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/21/3270669

28 Lynwood Avenue, Waterloooville, PO8 8PZ

- 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 J Waite against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/20/01094, dated 30 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is to raise main ridge with dormers.
-

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 property and the street scene of Lynwood Avenue.

Reasons

3. Lynwood Avenue is an established residential area characterised by bungalows set back from the road with frontages primarily either open or bounded by hedges. With grass verges to either side, the road has a spacious feel. The bungalows are of two different designs, the majority being semi-detached chalet bungalows with steeply pitched roofs, gables to the sides and modest dormers relative to the large roofs in the front and rear roof slopes. The other bungalows are slightly lower, with shallower roof pitches and gables to the front and rear, linked by flat-roofed garages. The gaps between the properties, including over the flat-roofed garages, also contribute positively to the attractive spacious character and appearance of the Avenue.
4. A detached dwelling on the corner of Lynwood Avenue and Sutton Road, next to the appeal property, with an asymmetric catslide roof, is an exception to the predominant building designs. However, the roof forms of the other properties and the symmetry between pairs of dwellings are distinctive features and a characteristic of Lynwood Avenue. I observed during my site visit that there has been very little alteration to the roof slopes visible from the road.
5. The appeal property is one of the lower bungalows and is characteristic of that design in the Avenue. The raising of the height of the ridge of the roof by approximately 1.1 m would result in a steeper roof pitch. Although the dormers have been raised above the eaves line, they would still be large relative to the roof in height, depth and length. They would dominate the roof rather than being subservient in the manner of the existing dormers visible on properties on Lynwood Avenue. They would thus be contrary to the guidance on dormers in the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

6. The dormers would significantly increase the bulk of the host property resulting in the loss of its characteristic form. They would also upset the symmetry with its attached neighbour, and the dormer on the southern roof slope would diminish the gap between the two at roof level. Consequently, the extended dwelling would be at odds with the majority of the other dwellings in the Avenue. The dormers would be clearly visible from Lynwood Avenue when passing and approaching from either direction, particularly from the south-west due to a bend in the road.
7. The side of a dormer on the asymmetrically-roofed dwelling to the other side of the host property is visible from Lynwood Avenue. I note that this dwelling was originally of the same design as the appeal property but it is very much the exception. Whilst alterations have been made to the roofs of other properties in the wider area, particularly on Silverdale Drive as I observed during my site visit, and the south-eastern dormer of No.135 Silverdale Drive is visible from Lynwood Avenue, the appeal property would not be seen in the context of these.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposals would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene of Lynwood Avenue. Accordingly, in this respect, they would conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which promotes high quality design.

Other Matter

9. I understand the appellant's desire for additional accommodation for his family. However, I have no evidence that the existing dwelling is substandard. I have also borne in mind that that the development would remain long after the appellant's personal circumstances have ceased to be material. Therefore, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

10. I have found above that the proposals would conflict with the development plan. There are no considerations that outweigh this conflict and indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
11. For this reason, and having regard to the other matter raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR