



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2026

by E Pickernell BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/25/3368507

42 Hyde Abbey Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 7DA

- 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 Ashby-Lumsden against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00157/HOU.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear facing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the appellants' names in the banner heading above from the appeal form because this information was incomplete on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Winchester Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terrace, two-storey dwelling which is part of a terrace of similar properties. To the east of this grouping, the terraced properties are taller, differ in design and have dormers on the front elevations. There is some variety in building form in the area, including some more modern development, however, traditional terraced properties are particularly prevalent.
5. Although there are some exceptions, the rear roof slopes of these terraces are largely unaltered except for the insertion of roof lights, giving a strong horizontal emphasis and a high degree of consistency to the roofscape in the area.
6. The site is located within the Winchester CA. The CA is large, covering most of the city centre and some suburban areas. Across the CA the topography and landscape varies, including elevated areas with views onto the city. The townscape also varies in its street patterns which reflect their historical development.
7. The Winchester Conservation Area Project (2003) divides the CA into sub-areas, the appeal site being situated within the Hyde-Northern Suburb Area. The appraisal recognises that amongst other things terraces and the use of brick represent unifying features within the streets that comprise this sub-area. Insofar as is relevant to the appeal, the significance of the CA is derived from its

architecture, street layout and use of materials. The appeal property is typical of the area and within the overall townscape context makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

8. The proposed dormer would be located on the rear facing roof slope of the main part of the dwelling. It would be almost the entire width of the property and set back a minimal amount from the eaves, resulting in the loss of the majority of the existing original rear roof slope. Furthermore, as a result of its overall size and its boxy design, along with the large windows, the dormer would be an overly bulky addition to the property which would fail to respect the proportions of the original building resulting in a top-heavy appearance.
9. The dormer would be of a modern design using dark grey standing seam metal cladding, a material which has been used successfully on other buildings nearby within the CA. However, this would not address my concerns about the overall mass and bulk of the dormer. As such the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. Moreover, due to its size combined with its elevated position, the dormer would interrupt and erode the consistency and linear emphasis of the roofscape of the terrace. This would be especially apparent from vantage points in Marston Gate. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with a key characteristic of the CA and as such would harm its character, appearance and significance, as a whole.
11. Planning permission has been granted for a dormer window of a very similar design at a property to the east of the appeal site, within the same terrace. Were this to be built, the consistency which was evident at the time of my site visit would be somewhat reduced.
12. However, the approved dormer would not be as visible in public vantage points, would sit nearer to the taller buildings within the eastern part of the terrace and therefore, would not be as prominent as the appeal scheme would be. As such, even if the context altered in this way, the roofscape would remain mostly intact and the proposal would still result in harm to the character and appearance of the CA. As such the approved scheme does not justify allowing the appeal.
13. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. In this case the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, such harm would be at a moderate degree of magnitude. The Framework requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would provide much needed accommodation for a growing family; however, this would be a largely private benefit to which I can attach only limited weight. As such the benefits of the scheme are outweighed by the great weight that must be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
14. I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Winchester CA. It would therefore conflict with Policies DM15, DM16 and DM27 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (Adopted April 2017). Together these seek to ensure that developments are well designed, respect local distinctiveness and conserve or enhance CAs.

Conclusion

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

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR