



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/24/3354528

5 Rownhams Lane, North Baddesley, Hampshire SO52 9GE

- 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 Colin Davis against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01720/FULLS.
 - The development proposed is described as “Loft Conversion - Creating a FF habitable space. Ridge raise included into designs to allow for sufficient internal head height for client.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached single storey dwelling located adjacent to the junction of Rownhams Lane and Stragwyne Close. The appeal site is located in a primarily residential area characterised by a variety of house types, of differing architectural styles. However, the immediate context comprises dwellings of a similar scale and form to the appeal property.
4. It is proposed to raise the height of the roof of the appeal property and to construct a flat roof dormer on the rear roof slope. The appeal property fronts Stragwyne Close with the gabled side elevation facing Rownhams Lane. It is set forward of the property to the southeast and is separated from the properties to the north by the road. In this context, the very modest increase in height of the bungalow proposed would not appear incongruous or result in the building appearing overly prominent in the street scene.
5. However, due to the orientation of the host dwelling and its position, forward of the neighbouring property to the south, the proposed dormer would be highly visible, primarily from Rownhams Lane, which I observed to be a busy through-road. The proposed dormer would be almost the full width of the roof slope and would be situated very close to the eaves and ridge of the roof. Consequently, the dormer would be an addition of considerable size and bulk which would be disproportionate to the host dwelling and overwhelm the rear roof slope.
6. Furthermore, the design of the proposed dormer, in particular its extensive flat roof would result in a bland and boxy addition to the property which would jar

awkwardly with the design and proportions of the original building. The dormer would be a prominent addition to the property which would be incongruous in the street scene.

7. I acknowledge that dormers are a relatively common feature in the local area with a variety of different forms evident in close proximity to the appeal site. However, those I observed at my site visit were either smaller in scale or set further in from the eaves and ridge of the host dwelling. As such they do not represent such disproportionate additions and do not result in the same degree of harm to the character and appearance of the area as the appeal scheme would.
8. The appellant has made reference to an extension they consider to be similar to the appeal scheme, however I have been given limited details of this and therefore cannot be certain that there are any parallels with the site and proposal before me. In any event, I have considered the proposal on its own merits bearing in mind the context of the appeal site. I noted the presence of a tree which has been planted on the verge adjacent to the appeal site. I acknowledge that as the tree grows, it would filter views of the proposed dormer from some vantage points. However, it would still be highly visible particularly on approach from the south, and as such the tree would not fully mitigate the harm I have identified.
9. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD Adopted Local Plan 2011 – 2029 (Adopted January 2016) which seeks to ensure that development is of high quality in terms of design and local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. I recognise that the proposed extension would be of great value to the appellant and their family, providing much needed additional accommodation. However, limited weight can be given to personal circumstances and as such this would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR