



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2022

by J Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10TH February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/21/3288377

35 Church Lane, Colden Common, Hampshire, SO21 1TW

- 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 Andrew Brooks against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00350/HOU, dated 8 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is Construction of a front porch; ground floor single storey extension; first floor extension and balcony. A log burner and flue to be incorporated on the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. There is a mix of property types generally in Church Lane with a predominance of bungalows and one and a half storey properties. As such the heights of the buildings are generally modest in their appearance.
4. The appeal property has already been altered several times and the appellant wishes to rework parts to incorporate two additional single storey extensions and a further storey over part of the building. The eaves of the additional storey would be the same height as the existing ridge. The design would incorporate a large half hipped gable facing the lane and a full height glazed gable to the rear, this would project marginally further into the garden than the existing rear of the property. The ridge of the proposed new roof would run at right angles to the existing ridge of the bungalow.
5. Policy CP13 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 (2013) (Local Plan Pt.1) and Policy DM15 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (2017) (Local Plan Pt.2) seek to secure high quality design expecting that the site and its surroundings should inform the principles of design and be locally distinctive. Moreover, the adopted Winchester City Council Supplementary Planning Document – High Quality Places (2015) seeks to ensure extensions, even when they take a contrasting approach to design, should be subservient to the original building in terms of scale.

6. The additional storey to part of the building would be around 2.8 metres taller than the existing ridge. A significant ridge length exceeding the existing building height and set at right angles to it would subsume half of the bungalow and stand above the ridge of the remainder. Cumulatively the window pattern, overall mass, height, and proportions of the first-floor extension would read awkwardly with the host building. The resulting structure would be highly visible and discordant in the street scene. It would lack any measure of subservience to the original property and this would be particularly apparent due to the modest scale of adjacent buildings against which the additional storey would be overwhelming. It would, as a result, be bulky, dominant and incongruous.
7. There are examples of half hipped gables facing Church Lane however the eaves of those buildings are much lower than that proposed here, such that they are not comparable with the appeal proposal.
8. For the above reasons, the scale and massing of the proposal, including the horizontal emphasis of high-level window openings on the north elevation, would compare unfavourably with buildings in the immediate locality. This would result in an obtrusive and jarring appearance which would be at odds with, and harmful to, the character and appearance of the site and the wider context of Church Lane. It would therefore fail to contribute positively to the local character and distinctiveness of the area.
9. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policy C13 of the Local Plan Pt.1, Policy DM15 of the Local Plan Pt.2 and the adopted Winchester City Council Supplementary Planning Document – High Quality Places (2015) and to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the distinctiveness of the local area and creates individual places with distinctive character and which generally requires domestic extensions to be subservient to the host building. I find no conflict with Policy DM16 of the Local Plan Pt.2 as this relates to wider site design rather than domestic extensions to buildings as is the case here.

Other Matters

10. It has been emphasised that there were no public objections to the scheme or concerns raised by the Parish Council and that the Council made only broad references to the policies and guidelines in the Local Plan. The lack of local objection is noted however it does not alter my findings in respect of the main issue. I have drawn my own conclusions on the content of the development plan policies as set out above.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties in the locality where alterations have taken place. I have had regard to those examples including the one immediately adjacent to the appeal site. However, none appear to be comparable such that they would alter my findings.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having considered all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J Wilson INSPECTOR