



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/21/3283676

35 Charlesworth Drive, Waterloooville, PO7 6AX

- 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 Stacy Dugan against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/21/00825, dated 21 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension; removal of existing conservatory and replace with single storey rear extension; loft conversion including front and rear dormers and hip to gable with cladding on gable ends; render to elevation and fenestration alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the northern side of Charlesworth Drive. Beyond the eastern (side) boundary of the appeal site is Armstrong Close, a cul-de-sac of five properties. The host property comprises a detached bungalow that is in the process of being extended to provide a chalet style bungalow. There are similar detached and semi-detached bungalows, some with roof accommodation, to the west, east and south of the appeal site on Charlesworth Drive, as well as on Armstrong Close to the north.
4. Planning permission to extend the host property for a similar form of development to that proposed in this appeal was granted by the Council on 16 July 2021 (ref. APP/21/00179) (July 2021 Permission). That permission is currently being implemented with works well advanced on site. The main difference between the July 2021 Permission and the current appeal proposal is that the former included approval for two new dormers on the rear elevation, whereas this appeal seeks permission for a single larger dormer on the rear elevation. As I observed on site, the approved rear dormers are already in place. The appeal proposal would effectively extend those dormers by infilling the gap between the two to provide a single larger dormer.
5. There are no dormers on the properties immediately to the west and east of the appeal site, which draws attention to the new dormers on the host

property, the rear of which is highly visible from various public vantage points, particularly on Armstrong Close. From those vantage points, the scale and width of the proposed dormer would appear excessive. It would dominate the rear roof to the host property, and, as a result of its overall bulk and width it would be out of scale with the character and appearance of the host property. The proposed dormer would not be subordinate or proportional to the roof of the host property.

6. In comparison, the approved dormers are more modest in terms of their scale and width, and for these reasons, as I observed on site, they sit more comfortably on the rear roofscape and are not visually dominant. The same would not be the case for the proposed dormer, which would appear over-sized and would visually dominate the roof plane, resulting in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
7. Reference has been made to examples of other dormers within the surrounding area. Whilst I viewed these on my site visit, none of these examples are, in my judgement, directly comparable to the appeal proposal, particularly in terms of their overall scale and width. Some of the examples were in roads far away from the appeal site and no information has been provided on the planning circumstances that led to their construction. I also note that the Council have indicated that a number pre-date current design guidance. I also agree with the Council that the context appears different in that the proposed larger dormer must be viewed against the large increase in the scale and bulk of the original roof to the host property that has already resulted from the July 2021 Permission, including the raising of the ridge height, a hip to gable extension and new front dormers.
8. Both parties have referred to the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD). Paragraph 5.47 of this SPD states that dormers should be set back below the ridge and above the eaves, and set in from the verges of the roof. Whilst the appeal proposal would broadly meet those requirements, paragraph 5.48 states that dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building. As I have found above, the proposed dormer would dominate this part of the main roof and would not be in proportion to the rear elevation of the host property.
9. Accordingly, I find that the proposed dormer on the rear elevation to the host property would be contrary to policy CS16 (High Quality Design) of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the relevant guidance of the SPD.

Conclusions

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

G Roberts

INSPECTOR