



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/25/3368876

20 Tunworth Close, Fleet, Hampshire, GU51 1DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nick Jones against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Reference is 25/00668/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft into habitable accommodation to include two rear pitched roof dormers with a mansard style infill and two roof lights to the front roof slope.
-

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 property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is two storey house, with attractive proportions and elevations, on a corner plot. It is within an area of established residential character at middle to higher density and the range of properties, landscape and street layout all come together to create a locality of pleasing, almost understated, appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. I found the local roofscape to be a key feature which contributes positively to the aesthetic quality of the area. For the most part there is a subtle and harmonious feel to this upper level of the properties. Unfortunately, the scheme before me would not sit comfortably in this context. Even with the use of matching materials the bulky and unusually shaped rear dormer arrangement would look misplaced and be jarring on the eye. The position here has a degree of prominence and there would be some impact on the streetscene as well as on the architectural qualities of the house itself.
 5. The front elevation would also be eroded in quality as result of the appeal scheme. This is because the combined glazing in the co-joined rooflights would simply appear excessive and not relate in size or positioning to windows below. This front roof light arrangement would also bear little or no correlation to other much lower-key 'attic' windows found locally.
-

6. In summary the overall design proposed and scale of change is not suited to the character or appearance of this dwelling or its context.
7. Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan 2032 and saved Policy GEN1 of The Hart Local Plan 2006 are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek good quality development, with suitable architectural design and scale such that a scheme is complementary to its immediate and wider context, reflects surroundings, and generally protects local character. This is reflected within the design guidance of Urban Characterisation and Density Study (UCDS) for Hart, albeit this is a document which cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with the two development plan policies and the relevant objectives of the UCDS.

Other matters

8. I do understand the wish to increase the accommodation for this locally established family and I hope that a satisfactory solution can be found. I can see that efforts were made to try and overcome the Council's reservation over a previous scheme and it is regrettable that there was seemingly some difficulty liaising with the authority. The technical and structural issues are unfortunate and I appreciate that innovative design is being put forward here in an attempt to deal with this. I would agree with the Council that, given submitted plans, parking provision would not be an issue and I note that neighbours do not raise objection to the appeal scheme.
9. I have reviewed other examples of roof alterations drawn to my attention but in terms of design, location or scale find them to be different from the case in hand. I would also assess that not all the examples would represent the quality of design one should necessarily use as a benchmark. In any event I must determine this proposal on its own merits.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR