



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/23/3327288

8 Beech Drive, Blackwater, CAMBERLEY, GU17 0NA

- 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 Charakupa against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00664/HOU, dated 14 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft into habitable accommodation by installing a full-length rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached bungalow which lies in a residential area of similar properties. It is proposed to form a flat roof dormer on the rear roof slope.
4. I note that the local parish council raises 'no objection' to the proposal and there have been no letters of objection put forward by the local community.

Effect on character and appearance

5. The existing property is of modest scale with a pitched roof of a low angle. There is no objection in principle to the attic being used for habitable accommodation, however, this appears to have restricted headroom resulting in the proposed rear dormer being of a height which exceeds the main roof ridge of the existing property. Moreover, the dormer is proposed to run virtually the entire length of the rear roof slope. This would produce a visually awkward feature the gable end of which would be seen in the street scene and through the gap to No.9. The form of extension proposed would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property and its contribution to the street scene. It therefore does not accord with the provisions of Policy NBE9 of the Local Plan in achieving high quality design.
6. The proposal also goes against guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages development to be well-designed, visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

7. The appellants refer to other addresses locally which are said to have similar dormers which extend above the ridge of the roof and these are said to set a precedent in favour of the appeal scheme. I looked at many of these at my visit. From the evidence submitted it is not clear whether these dormer extensions are 'permitted development' or have been approved by the Council or are unauthorised. Notwithstanding this, most of the extensions I saw do not extend along the whole length of the roof of the property and are set in from the ends and usually some element of sloping roof remains. I also appreciate that many existing dormers tend to extend on both front and back roof slopes, whereas the appeal scheme only relates to the rear roof slope. In some ways the proposal would have less visual impact than many of the front dormers mentioned by the appellant but these extended properties are very much in the minority in this street and the simple roof slope remains the dominant architectural form in the street scene and which helps establish the local character.
8. On balance I find that the reference to other dormer windows does not outweigh my conclusion about the harm that the proposed dormer would do to the appearance of the host property and the general street scene.
9. This harm and the conflict with the relevant part of the development plan is not outweighed by other considerations and this indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR