



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/22/3304151
28 Allbrook Knoll, Eastleigh SO50 4RX

- 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 Keith Smith against the decision of the Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/22/92730, dated 16 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an external lift and dormer to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development described above has been carried out. As such this appeal relates to a planning application for retrospective planning permission.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey house with an attached garage to the side and various additions and outbuildings to the rear. It is sited on a corner and there is an open space and pathway to its rear. As a consequence of this it is a prominent feature in the local environment.
5. The surrounding area comprises houses and bungalows of similar age and appearance with integral garages and generally open front boundaries. Whilst I note that a dormer has been installed within the rear roof slope of the house next door to the appeal property, dwellings in the area generally retain their original roof form and the gaps between properties are largely retained at first and roof levels. The area therefore retains a relatively high level of unity, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
6. The appeal scheme comprises a dormer addition in the rear roof slope and a side addition that extends between the garage and dormer and houses a lift. The dormer and lift enclosure are prominent and incongruous additions to the appeal property that, due to their size, siting and design, have resulted in

unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

7. For this reason, the appeal scheme fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022), which states that all new development should take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), the former of which states that in streets with very uniform roof design, significant alterations are generally unacceptable.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR