
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022

by S Harley BSc(Hons) M.Phil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/21/3287098

35 Cranmer Drive, Nursling SO16 0TD

- 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 Paul Blay against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02752/FULLS, dated 20 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and full width dormer to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modern detached house in a relatively small garden in an estate of similar properties. It is within a built up area where extensions to residential properties would be acceptable provided other planning policies and material considerations would be satisfied. Cranmer Drive is a long winding cul de sac with smaller cul de sacs leading off it. No 35 is a corner plot positioned inside a right angled bend. One side wall of the house is very close to the edge of the footpath.
4. The proposed side elevations and section show there would be very little, if any, roof slope visible above the flat roof of the proposed dormer and very little below it. Although the dormer sides would be set in from the edges of the roof I conclude that due to its size, scale and position relative to the existing roof, it would appear dominant and out of proportion with the host property. This would not amount to high quality design. Moreover, due to the way the houses are laid out, the rear roof of No 35 is very prominent as viewed from the continuation of Cranmer Drive, where it leads to a footpath, and Watley Close opposite. Accordingly, the proposed dormer would be visually prominent, top heavy and would disproportionately over dominate the street scene.
5. The appellant has indicated that the sides could have a brick finish to match the walls of the house instead of being timber clad. However, this would not be sufficient to overcome the concerns I have identified about the scale of the dormer in relation to the existing roof. Moreover, brick sides could appear more heavy weight than timber, adding to the appearance of mass and over dominance.

6. I conclude that the proposed dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD 2016 (the LP) which seeks high quality development that would integrate with, respect and complement the local area.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge that no objections have been made by local residents or Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council. However, there are many reasons why objections may not be made. I have reached my own conclusions based on the planning merits of the proposal.
8. A similar dormer has been built at 21 Balmoral Way, Rownhams but this is not as intrusive due to its position relative to the street. It was constructed as permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended. Permitted development rights for a dormer are not available for No 35 as they were removed by a condition attached to the estate permission to give the Council control of development in the interests of the appearance of the area.
9. A rear extension has been constructed at No 37 Cranmer Drive. However, whatever the impact on the living conditions of occupiers of adjacent properties, the ridge of that roof extension is much lower than that of the main roof and it is less dominant when viewed from the street. Byways at Toogoods Lane is a much lower building, originally single storey, and more of the host roof form appears around the dormer. None of the examples cited lead me to any different conclusion in respect of the proposal before me.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and there would be conflict with Policy E1 of the development plan in this respect. I have found insufficient material considerations to outweigh this conflict. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Harley

INSPECTOR