

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2023

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/22/3313613

26 Victory Avenue, Horndean, Waterlooville PO8 9PH

- 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 Ms Nadine Angell against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application, Ref. 59896, dated 16 September 2022 was refused by notice dated 29 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of 2 No. front dormers, gable build up and single storey rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has not objected to the proposed single storey rear extension and I note that the appeal plans include a note that this is to be constructed as permitted development. My consideration of this appeal is therefore limited to the proposed front dormers and the associated build-up of the side gable.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of Nos. 26 & 28 Victory Avenue and the Victory Avenue street scene.

Reasons

4. I saw on my visit that No. 26 is one half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows, the other half being No. 28 and having a modestly sized box dormer on its front roof slope. Whilst not highlighted in the officer's report, the pair of Nos. 26 & 28 are a distinctive part of the street scene also comprising the pairs of Nos. 30 & 32 and 34 & 36. All three pairs are of the same design and external materials, and apart from the aforementioned box dormer their front elevations remain unaltered from their original form, possibly mid C20th.
 5. Whilst the existing roof addition at No. 28 detracts from the symmetry of the pair and indeed to some extent the row of six dwellings, it does not significantly alter the pleasingly simple and uncluttered design of the pair which with its similar neighbours makes a positive contribution to the street scene.
-

6. The appeal scheme however would have a noticeably different impact. This is because both the pitched roof design and the large size of the dormers would not be in keeping with the size and design of the existing bungalow, particularly the front elevation. And as the Council has pointed out, the dwelling would have a top-heavy appearance that would appear incongruous. Furthermore, when seen together with the small scale and flat roof dormers of the adjoining No. 28, this perception of incongruity would be all the greater.
7. I acknowledge that there are other dormers of this size and design in the road, but they form part of bungalows that are quite different in both size and design. Bearing in mind the existing characteristics of No. 26, the Council is in my view correct to advise that a smaller flat roof dormer of the type already at No. 28 at would be far more appropriate, albeit I acknowledge that it and the absence of a side gable build-up would not provide the internal accommodation sought by the appellant.
8. In summary, I find that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of Nos. 26 & 28 Victory Avenue and the street scene. This would conflict with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy 2014; Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review 2006, and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR