



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2025

by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/24/3349810

62 St. Vincent Crescent, Horndean, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 9JD

- 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 & Mrs J Warne against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 60244/001.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as, "Construction of single storey front extension to include the repositioning of the front entrance, 2 No. dormers to front roof slope, rear dormer, gable build up and installation of rooflight to existing rear extension (re-submission of 60244)".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. It is clear from the Council's decision that its sole objection relates to the rear dormer and associated works. I have no evidence before me to reach a contrary view to the Council in this regard and therefore the consideration of this appeal focuses on the effect of the rear dormer and associated works.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises 62 St. Vincent Crescent (No 62), a semi-detached dormer bungalow located in a predominantly residential area. No 62 presents as a modestly-sized but attractive property, situated on a plot with a long rear garden. No 62 is similar in style to nearby properties along St. Vincent Crescent.
5. The proposed development would replace the existing rear pitched roof dormer with a larger rear box dormer. The rear dormer proposed would span across almost the full width of the rear elevation of No 62. Due to its width and height it would be a very large structure relative to the roof within which it would be positioned. As such, because of its scale and massing it would constitute a prominent and overly-dominant feature on the rear roof slope of No 62. It would accordingly be unsympathetic to the character of No 62.
6. The proposed development would therefore clearly not comply with the guidance given in the Residential Extensions & Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2018) which provides that, amongst other things,

new dormer windows need to be well designed, which normally relies on ensuring that they are not over-scaled and do not dominate the roof.

7. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property. It would conflict with part a) of Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (adopted 2014) which provides that, amongst other things, new development will be required to seek exemplary standards of design and architecture with a high quality external appearance that respect the area's particular characteristics, and with Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (adopted 2006) which provides that, amongst other things, alterations and extensions to buildings will only be permitted if they are designed to take account of the design, scale and character of the original building.
8. The proposed development would also conflict with paragraph 135 b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which provides that, amongst other things, planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Other Matters

9. Reference has been made to a previous scheme, with a reduced rear dormer. Whilst I note the benefits of the proposed development in terms of cost and construction methods, these are not matters which outweigh the proposed development's unambiguous conflict with the relevant policies of the development plan cited on the main issue above.
10. Therefore, none of the other considerations material to the proposed development indicate that this appeal decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR