



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/22/3308118

27 Hobb Lane, Hedge End, Southampton SO30 0GG

- 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 and Mrs Ian Perry against the decision of the Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/22/93179, dated 6 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2022
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing conservatory, replacement of the detached garage and erection of a two-storey rear extension and front dormer to create first floor accommodation.
-

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 street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof form. It is situated in a residential street and forms part of a group of bungalows of similar age and appearance. Whilst many of these dwellings have been extended to the rear, and some include small dormers at the front, they all retain the hipped roof form at the front and consequently form a relatively cohesive group. This gives this portion of Hobb Lane a high level of unity, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
4. The proposal would include the erection of a full-width rear extension and the expansion of the roof to create a barn-style roof form. In addition, gables would be formed above the pair of bay windows at the front. Due to its size and siting the enlarged roof form at the front would be an overly prominent and incongruous feature that would be at odds with the appearance of the group of bungalows of which the appeal property forms part. This incongruity would be further exacerbated by the gabled bay windows.
5. For these reasons I conclude that due to its siting, bulk and design, the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022), which states that all new

development should take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), the former of which states that in streets with very uniform roof design, significant alterations are generally unacceptable.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR