



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by J Heppell BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/25/3358301

6 Pine Close, Olivers Battery, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 4JX

- 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 Marquis against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01806/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and rear extension, porch canopy and elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant submitted amended plans during the determination of the application, which were accepted by the local planning authority, and which therefore form the basis of this appeal. I have used the appellant's original description of development, which accurately describes the amended proposals.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in Olivers Battery, a residential area on the outskirts of Winchester which is characterised by detached dwellings on well proportioned, well landscaped plots. Properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are predominantly bungalows, with the adjacent Beech Close containing two storey dwellings. The appeal site slopes down from east to west.
5. 6 Pine Close consists of a two storey mono-pitched element and a single storey hipped roof element, linked by a flat roof single storey section. It has two single storey projections, a lean-to one at the side and a flat roofed one at the front. The appellant proposes to remove the hipped roof above the single storey section and add a flat roofed first floor element extending to the rear of the property, which would be positioned above the single storey link section and partially above the currently hipped roof element; along with other alterations to the property.
6. Whilst the appeal property is no longer a bungalow by virtue of the first floor extension which has been constructed, the addition of a flat roofed first floor extension would contrast with both the newer mono-pitched elements of the host property and the hipped roofs which characterise the other bungalows in Pine

Close. Whilst the built mono-pitched first floor extension respects the low-rise form of the dwelling, the scale and rectangular form of the proposed extension would introduce a dominant and discordant central section that would be harmful to the appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

7. The Olivers Battery Village Design Statement (VDS) places the appeal site within the Old Kennels Lane Character Area, and makes specific reference to the unusual design of the bungalows in Pine Close, each of which features two modular single storey units linked together. The appeal property, although much altered, retains the appearance of two linked sections. By proposing a central first floor element, the proposals would unbalance the property and conflict with Design Guideline SK3 of the VDS, which advises that the conversion of single storey dwellings into two storey dwellings should only be permitted where the roof height and overall bulk of the resulting dwelling would not dominate the street scene. I note that the VDS was published in 2008 and that only a minority of the bungalows remain unextended. However, owing to the sensitive design of the extensions that have taken place, the description of Pine Close in the VDS remains accurate.
8. The appellant highlights that the height of the flat roof extension would be lower than the existing ridge height, but this does not overcome my concern regarding the design of the extension. The appellant points out that many properties have been successfully extended in the Olivers Battery area, with examples of angular roofs set amongst more traditional roof forms, and that the character of Pine Close has begun to evolve. However, given that no properties in Pine Close have been extended in the manner proposed, I afford these arguments limited weight. Given that Pine Close is a cul-de-sac with its own particular character, the location of three storey dwellings along Beyne Road some distance to the rear of the appeal site is not a consideration that would make the scale of the proposed extension acceptable in design terms.
9. The High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document advises that where roof shapes in an area are very consistent – as they are in Pine Close – then reflecting those shapes in new design can often help to ensure that new development is successfully integrated, but the appeal proposals do not do this. Likewise, the harm that the proposal would cause to the host dwelling and the street scene would not be compensated for by the lack of visibility from public rights of way.
10. I conclude therefore that the appeal proposals would be out of character with and harmful to the host property and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy CP13 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1: Joint Core Strategy and Policies DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations. Together, these policies, amongst other matters, promote high quality design and local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has set out that the proposed development would meet the needs of the occupants, that it would be energy efficient in compliance with relevant criteria of policies CP13 and DM16, that it would have ample natural light and that it represents an efficient use of land that avoids loss of garden space and associated biodiversity. However, these factors are insufficient to outweigh the harm that the

proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area and the conflict with the development plan identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

J Heppell

INSPECTOR