



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2024

by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/24/3344931

**Ryecroft, 33 Springvale Road, Kings Worthy, Winchester, Hampshire
SO23 7ND**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Bostel against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00167/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor addition, roof, fenestration and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the first-floor addition now proposed would have on the character and appearance of Ryecroft itself and the surrounding area, compared with a higher replacement pitched roof previously approved.¹

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in an area which exhibits a great variety in type and size of building. Opposite Ryecroft, for example, is Elan Court, a large-scale, contemporary development featuring mono-pitch roofs and, nearby in Roberts Close, the modern Myers Touch kitchen showroom, which has a flat roof and glazed elevations. However, there are also many conventional, pitched-roof bungalows, of which Ryecroft is an example, although No 37 next door also has a mono-pitch roof profile, as well as a striking canine statue visible above the shared boundary.
4. In this local architectural context, I see nothing in principle against an original or unorthodox design for a domestic extension. However, in the present case, I agree with the Council that the rectilinear addition, proposed over some two fifths of the width of the bungalow, would appear out of keeping, disproportionate and excessively dominant with respect to the existing dwelling. I consider that it would make this part of the building appeal unduly top-heavy and the whole bungalow visually unbalanced. This would detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the existing building. It would do this in a manner that the previously approved, higher pitched roof

¹ 22/02153/HOU

- would not, even accepting that it would extend over the whole width of the building.
5. Moreover, the extension would jut above the roof level of No 31 adjacent, in jarring contrast with its simple pitched roof form. Otherwise, I accept that Ryecroft is set back in its own grounds with boundary screening limiting direct views from Springvale Road or other properties. Nevertheless, comparative unobtrusiveness is no justification for approving a design which is unacceptable in itself.
 6. For these reasons, the development now proposed would fail to comply with the provisions of Policies CP13, DM16 and MTRA2 of the adopted Winchester District Local Plan and related supplementary guidance. These are essentially consistent with national planning policy in seeking high quality design, responding positively to the character of the locality, with extensions generally being proportionate and subservient to their host dwelling. The proposal is thus to be regarded as contrary to the development plan for Winchester as a whole.
 7. I recognise that there are no local objections to the proposed design but this does not override my conclusion on the main planning issue. I also note that the Appellants are discontent with the manner in which the Council handled the application. However, this appeal provides for an entirely fresh and independent appraisal of the case.
 8. For the reasons explained above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR