



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/24/3351875

Bee Cottage, 15 Loxwood Avenue, Church Crookham, Fleet GU51 5NS

- 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 Daniel Welch against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 24/01135/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as '*Changing a single dormer on the front aspect of the house first floor to a box type dormer, pursuant to 17/00902/HOU*'.
-

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 dwelling and the street scene of Loxwood Avenue.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached late C20th bungalow on an open plan estate, mainly of bungalows and chalet bungalows. Planning permission was granted for extensions to the property in 2015 and 2017 and the appeal scheme seeks to amend the latter consent through a change from the small pitched roof dormer on the front elevation to a large flat roof dormer occupying most of the existing roof plane.
4. However, the appeal building is semi-detached, being one half of a pair that were originally of matching design and more modest size than other buildings nearby. That initial symmetry has already been affected by the alterations and additions at No. 15, including a change in the roof from hip to gable.
5. The now proposed box dormer is essentially functional and has little design merit. It would be a bulky addition that would dominate the appearance of the dwelling from the road and increase still further the imbalance with its attached neighbour. As such, the proposal would conflict with the requirements of Policy NBE9a) of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 adopted in 2020 and with Saved Policy GEN1(i) of the Hart Local Plan 2006. I also consider that the development would be contrary to Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024.
6. The grounds of appeal refer to other large flat roof dormers in the vicinity. On my visit I saw three in Grenville Drive, albeit with one of these having a

shallow double pitch on its roof to improve its aesthetics. There may be one or two more, but they are certainly in the minority and in my view have an adverse effect on the host building concerned and the stretch of street scene within which they are located. The Council has not confirmed in the Officer's Report whether these examples have planning permission. Be that as it may, I do not consider them to be a precedent that should be followed given that they have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the dwelling and conflict with the aforementioned policies.

7. The appellant explains that the additional headspace of a flat roofed dormer is needed for his daughter's bedroom and would thereby enable all the family to sleep upstairs. However, whilst I have sympathy with this explanation, it is sometimes necessary to accept that residential development in the form of extensions is not just about private aspirations in terms of functional requirements but also includes the public interest of the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings. And in cases where these objectives cannot be mutually achieved it may be necessary for families to move to larger dwellings.
8. I have no knowledge whether this applies in this case but for the reasons explained above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR