



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/21/3283263

240 Botley Road, Burridge, SO31 1BL

- 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 & Mrs Ailes against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/21/0796/FP, dated 8 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and front and rear dormer extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and front and rear dormer extensions at 240 Botley Road, Burridge, SO31 1BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/21/0796/FP dated 8 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PG NO:10; PG NO:09; PG NO:02; PG NO:04; PG NO:08 and PG NO:06.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the decision notice is slightly different to that on the application form, and I have adopted the former as it more accurately describes the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the eastern side of Botley Road, which is a busy 'A' road. The host property, as with most properties on this side of Botley Road, is set back from the road with a driveway, parking and small garden area

at the front and a long garden at the rear. The host property is detached and whilst it may originally have comprised a single storey bungalow, extensive flat roofed dormers to the front and rear of the property provide a large area of living accommodation at first floor level.

5. The surrounding area comprises a mixture of detached bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings, that vary in terms of their age, style, scale, orientation, materials and layout. As such, there is no uniform character or built form to the streetscene. As I also observed on my site visit, a number of properties have converted their roofspace to habitable use with the benefit of dormer extensions or other forms of roof alterations. There are also examples of modern infill and some properties appear to have been extensively remodelled.
6. A number of properties also have outbuildings located in front of the main building line and examples are to be found immediately to the north and south of the appeal site, both of which have large single storey garages sited close to the back edge of the pavement. As a consequence of the latter and existing boundary hedging/trees, the host property is only visible from the Botley Road and public vantage points when passing directly in front of the appeal site.
7. Section 1 of the Council's 'Design Guidance' Supplementary Planning Document (December 2015) (SPD) provides advice to assist householders when seeking permission to extend or alter their properties. As a guide, it advises that dormer windows should be kept below the existing ridge line, not take up the whole of the roof plane and incorporate a gable or hipped design. For rear two storey extensions it advises that they should also sit below the existing ridge line and be subservient.
8. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a rear ground floor extension, to which the Council have raised no objection, a finding that I concur with. The proposal also involves extending the flat roofed dormer at the front to incorporate two linked gable ends that would cover most of the front roof and extend above the existing ridge line. At the rear, the northern side of the existing flat roofed dormer would be extended rearwards to incorporate a similar gable feature linking with that on the front elevation, and again extending above the main ridge line.
9. Whilst I accept that the extensions to the existing dormers would be large, and on the front elevation would extend over most of the original roof, a large part of this roof plane is already covered by the existing flat roofed dormer. In addition, the gabled design and new windows would replicate the design and proportions of the existing ground floor projecting gabled bays. In this respect, I agree with the Appellant that the result is a design that, on balance, is an improvement over the existing front elevation and removes a large area of flat roof that currently detracts from the appearance of the host property.
10. At the rear, the proposed gabled extension at first floor level would not extend across the full width of the property and would thus be reasonably proportionate to the host and to the new ground floor rear extension. It would again provide an improvement and add some interest to the appearance of the existing rear elevation and remove a further area of flat roof.
11. Although the SPD advises that new dormers and two storey rear extensions should be sited below the main ridge line, the SPD is, of course, guidance and

should be applied with some flexibility and not rigidly. Also, as part of any assessment regard should be had to the individual circumstances of the case, what the proposals are seeking to achieve and its local context. Moreover, whilst the proposed first floor elements have been described as dormer extensions, I am not convinced that this is an appropriate description for a proposal that effectively remodels the front and rear elevations of the host property at first floor level and improves the internal accommodation.

12. Within the above context and mindful that the ridge lines and roof heights of surrounding properties vary, I am satisfied that the proposed roof extensions would, on balance, sit reasonably comfortably on the host property and would not, as a consequence of its remodelled design, appear out of character. The proposal does not represent a poor design and would not materially upset the existing built rhythm of the streetscene. The end result would, in my judgement, be an improvement in the appearance of the host property and even though the new extensions would exceed the height of the main ridge line, this would not appear out of keeping with the host or the surrounding area. Moreover, the proposed extensions would not be overly discordant or dominant features.
13. For all the above reasons, the appeal proposal would not, in my judgement, lead to any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property or its local context. As I indicated above, that local context is varied and even though views of the host property, as extended, would be possible from directly in front of the appeal site, this would be seen against the backdrop of a streetscene that has no consistent built form, style or scale, and where there are bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey properties exhibiting a variety of roof forms and ridge heights.
14. I find therefore that whilst the appeal proposal would conflict with the guidance in the SPD, given the improvements to the design of the host property, its local context and varied character, as well as existing screening, this conflict would not be so significant as to justify the refusal of planning permission.
15. Accordingly, the appeal proposal would accord with policy CS17 of the Fareham Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and the corresponding policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (Framework).

Conditions

16. The Council has suggested various conditions in their Questionnaire which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. Conditions requiring compliance with the submitted plans and for materials to match existing are necessary and reasonable in order to reflect the details included within the application. I have, however, added a reference to the approved plans.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR