



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: 31ST December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/21/3284056

5 Broxburn Close, Chandler's Ford, SO53 5DX

- 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 S Dines against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/21/91144, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is raising of roof to the rear to provide first floor living accommodation and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of the proposed development on the Council's decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a small cul-de-sac of five detached properties. Due to the topography of the area, the host property is predominantly two storeys whereas the other properties within the cul-de-sac are predominantly single storey, albeit some have undercroft or split-level garages. The cul-de-sac itself is largely self-contained from the properties that surround it due in part to the topography, but primarily due to the mature trees found throughout the communal areas and within the individual plots. The result is a pleasant, low density and well landscaped small estate.
5. The appeal proposal involves, in part, the construction a single storey rear extension, to which the Council have not raised any objection, a finding that I concur with. The remaining part of the proposal involves raising the existing roof at the rear to provide additional accommodation at first floor level. The latter would extend above the height of the existing ridge to the host property. As I observed on my site visit, there are no roof extensions to any of the other properties within the cul-de-sac and their original shallow pitched roofs remain intact and are a positive feature of this small estate.

6. Within that context, the scale, mass, design and siting of the proposed roof extension would, in my judgement, be excessive. It would extend well above the existing ridge to the host property and whilst it would be sited on the rear part of the main roof, it would be highly visible. The proposal would represent an awkward and incongruous addition to the host property disrupting the rhythm of the existing roofscape particularly when viewed with its immediate neighbours. It would not be subordinate nor proportionate to the host property.
7. Due to the topography of the area and as the appeal site sits at a lower level to its neighbours, as I observed on site, even the rear roofscape to the host property is visible from public vantagepoints, from where this aspect of the appeal proposal would appear prominent and dominate its surroundings. Overall, the proposed roof extension would result in an unattractive addition that would not sit comfortably on the host property or within its immediate context.
8. The above findings are supported by the extracts I have been provided from the Kingsway Character Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which the appeal site, based on the plan included with that extract, forms part of. The SPD states that new extensions should ensure that they are compatible with the character of their neighbours and fit well into the overall streetscene. Saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011) (ELPR) also requires proposals to take full and proper account of their context and be appropriate in terms of, amongst other criteria, their scale, mass, design and siting. A similar approach is set out in draft policy DM1 of the Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036) (Draft ELP). In this particular case, the scale, mass, design and siting of the proposed roof extension would be incompatible with the host property and its surroundings, and would not fit in well with the streetscene. This aspect of the appeal proposal would not, therefore, comply with the criteria to saved policy 59.BE of the ELPR or the policy itself or with the guidance in the SPD.
9. The Appellant contends that the properties in the cul-de-sac are not identical, sit at different levels and heights, and that their orientation to the road also varies. Even so, the shallow pitched and uniform roofs are a particular characteristic of this small estate, as is the modest scale of the existing properties and as I have found, within that context, the proposed roof extension would be out of keeping and detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The Appellants also state that they looked at a number of options to extend the host property before proceeding with the appeal proposal, but that does not affect the findings I have reached or provide justification for the proposal before me.
10. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would be contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the ELPR, policy DM1 of the Draft ELP and the SPD guidance.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR