



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2023

by J Wellstead BA(Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/22/3302703

1 Maynards Wood, Chineham RG24 8DP

- 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 Wigmore against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03436/HSE, dated 5 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a second storey front extension.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area comprised predominantly of detached dwellings with differing designs, set back from the road behind parking and front garden areas.
4. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling which is accessed off Maynards Wood. It has a front dormer as well as a single-storey front projection that abuts Reading Road. Although this front projection was initially built as a double garage, one of the bays has since been converted into habitable accommodation.
5. The appeal scheme would introduce a first-floor extension above this front projection, including a roof light and two pitched roof dormer windows on the north-east elevation, one with a Juliet balcony, and a larger dormer to the south-west elevation which would have three roof lights and a crown-roof design. The ridge height of the appeal scheme would be in line with the existing front dormer and set below the main ridgeline of the host property.
6. The Basingstoke and Deane Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document 2018 states that proposed extensions should be subservient and in proportion to the host property. It states that dormers must not dominate the roof and need to complement the overall composition of the building(s) in terms of proportion, size, position, detailing and materials.
7. While there are numerous examples of front dormers in the area, these are predominantly of a smaller size and more traditional design, with the dormers

set down from the ridgeline, small in scale relative to the host roof plane. In contrast, the crown-roof dormer would dominate the roof plane due to its width and height. Although the crown-roof dormer would be below the ridgeline of the main roof, and in line with the height of the existing dormer, it would not be set down from the ridgeline of the roof on the front projection. It would therefore present as an awkward and bulky addition to the host building. The use of a series of roof lights along its pitched roof to light the interior further compounds the contrast to other dormers in the area, resulting in an incongruous design.

8. On the north-east elevation, the Juliet balcony would also be out of keeping with other dormers in the area because there are no other such examples in the street. In addition, it results in a dormer that extends below the level of the eaves of the host property, dominating a larger portion of the elevation and creating an unbalanced design which fails to match the height and style of the existing dormer on the host property. The third dormer also causes harm to the host property from a cumulative scale and individually due to the proposed crown roof and Juliet dormer window.
9. The appeal site is close to Reading Road. The existing garage sits further forward than the building line of neighbouring dwellings, which means that the appeal scheme would be incongruous by virtue of its siting so close to the road, as well as due to its unusual design as detailed above. The appeal site currently benefits from some screening due to the existing hedgerow. However, the appeal scheme would be clearly visible above the vegetation.
10. While the previous scheme¹ was considered to be subservient to the host dwelling due to its siting below the ridge height of the main body of the house, this is no longer the case, due to the added width, bulk and scale of the new design. Cumulatively the effect of the roof height extension and three dormer windows means this scheme is materially different to the previously approved scheme.
11. While there is a wide variety of architectural styles across properties in the locality, the appeal scheme would result in a markedly awkward design, and a building which would not relate well to others in the area.
12. In coming to this view, I have taken into account the unusual plot position and layout, and that matching materials to the host property. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
13. The Council did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed roof light on the south-west elevation, and I have no reason to disagree.
14. Although the Framework encourages decision-makers to seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible, it also states that development that is not well designed should be refused.
15. Overall, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (2016) and the objectives of the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which seeks to ensure - amongst other matters - that residential extensions positively contribute to local distinctiveness, the sense of place and the existing street

¹ Planning application reference 15/03740/HSE

scene. It would also fail to conform with aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which seeks to achieve well designed places.

Other Matters

16. A similar scheme was granted planning permission² on the 6 January 2016, but did not feature the larger dormer on the south-west side elevation nor the Juliet balcony and small roof light on the north-east elevation. Therefore, the proposed development is materially different to the previous scheme and has been considered on its own merits.
17. I understand that there are personal reasons which means the appellants' family would benefit from the appeal scheme, including the provision of additional and enhanced living space. However, this personal benefit does not outweigh the harm identified above. There is also nothing to indicate that the family's requirements could not be achieved through an alternative design. I therefore afford this matter limited weight.
18. I accept that the impact of the scheme on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants with regards to privacy can be mitigated to some extent with a condition requiring obscured glass on the dormer window on the outer side of the north-east elevation. However, the absence of harm is a neutral consideration in the determination of this appeal.
19. I accept that only two objections to the scheme have been submitted by a neighbouring resident and Chineham Parish Council. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given, the development fails to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework. There are no material considerations in this case which indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Wellstead

INSPECTOR

² Planning application reference 15/03740/HSE