



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2022

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/22/3290958

Burlair, Botley Road, Horton Heath SO50 7DQ

- 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 Burgess against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. H/21/91402, dated 23 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear extension and the raising of the roof line to form accommodation over and elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council states that it is progressing with modifications to the Emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (ELP). Given the advanced stage reached, I have afforded a high degree of weight to the ELP policy referred to in the Council's reason for refusal in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a detached chalet bungalow on Botley Road with off-street parking to the front. It is located within a row of other modest bungalows and chalets. The immediate vicinity is mainly residential in nature.
 5. The proposal broadly involves the enlargement of the first floor accommodation; raising the ridge line with extensions to the rear and side such that the built form would span almost the entire width of the plot at ground and first floor. The design would include three overlapping gable elements, one of which would project outwards to the front.
 6. The development would be clearly visible from the public domain and the surrounding curtilages of other properties in the vicinity. In my view, the extent of development would not be sympathetic to the relatively modest scale of the existing chalet bungalow and those properties to either side. The cumulative impact of the mass and bulk at first floor level, together with the substantial triple gable features, would appear dominant and obtrusive within the context of the local streetscene.
-

7. I appreciate that the locality comprises houses of varying sizes, ages, styles and designs, and that there are a number of gable elements on other properties within the streetscene. However, the photos provided by the appellant demonstrate that these are self-contained features on their respective dwellings, and do not overlap in the way proposed by this appeal. In any event, the appearance of other houses would be a neutral consideration in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. I acknowledge those other matters that have been advanced in support of the development; the scheme would use complementary materials, retain the front garden and parking area and have a sizeable rear amenity space. I am also aware that the addition would result in improvements to the layout of the dwelling to meet living requirements and there have been no objections from local residents. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified above.
9. I consider that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and Policy DM1 of the ELP, which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance. It would also be inconsistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

10. Based on the foregoing and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR