



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29th August 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/25/3369020

48 Charnwood Crescent, Chandlers Ford, Hampshire SO53 5QT

- 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 Audrius Puikys against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/25/99287.
 - The development proposed is extension of existing dormer roof to the eastern elevation with the addition of new dormer roofs to the western elevation of the main dwelling house. Extension above the existing single storey flat roofed garage with the addition of a pitched roof over.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a linked detached chalet bungalow featuring a single dormer on the east-facing roof slope. The garage is a single-storey structure with a flat roof, extending forward to form a porch. It is physically connected to the neighbouring property's garage, forming a pair of linked units.
4. The surrounding area, particularly this side of Charnwood Crescent, is characterised by a consistent architectural rhythm. Properties are predominantly bungalows with pitched roofs and gable ends fronting the street. Chalet bungalows typically feature a single dormer window on one roof slope and flat-roofed garages, arranged in linked pairs. This uniformity contributes positively to the established character and appearance of the street scene.
5. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner plot at a junction, making it more visually exposed within the streetscape. The proposed dormer extensions, particularly the enlarged eastern dormer and the two additional dormers on the western elevation, would introduce a visually dominant and disproportionate roof form. This would appear overbearing when viewed from the public realm and would fail to respond positively to the corner location. The design does not assist in turning the corner nor does it reflect the principles of good design as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
6. Furthermore, the proposed first-floor extension above the garage would disrupt the established pattern of flat-roofed garages in the area. The introduction of a pitched

roof to the garage and the location of the dormers in this location would result in a visually intrusive and overly complex form, at odds with the simplicity and coherence of the surrounding built form. The cumulative impact of the roof alterations and garage extension would harmfully undermine the uniformity of the area, which I have identified above as being a positive feature.

7. Although there are examples of roof alterations in the vicinity, these do not necessarily reflect high-quality or contextually appropriate design. For example, No. 32 has introduced a full-depth dormer on the eastern elevation, No. 38 features dormers on both roof slopes with a break between the two on the eastern pitch, and No. 42 has added full-depth dormers to both sides of the roof. These interventions are located mid-terrace and do not occupy visually prominent positions. Their presence does not establish a positive precedent; rather, they illustrate a gradual erosion of the area's original architectural character. The appeal proposal would further erode the character of the area and cannot be justified by reference to nearby developments that themselves detract from the coherence of the street scene. In planning terms, the existence of poor design elsewhere does not legitimise further harm.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal; would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (2022), which seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of urban areas. It would also be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes development that is sympathetic to local character and history.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR