



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/23/3327243

Glen Rosa, Hamble Lane, Bursledon, Hampshire, SO31 8DR

- 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 Mike Ellis against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/23/95395, dated 8 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a room in roof with front and rear dormers and hip to gable build up.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a two-storey, semi-detached pair of originally modest sized dwellings with a hipped roof and central ridge along the common boundary running front to back. Together with its attached neighbour, it sits at one end of a run of similar properties to this side of Hamble Lane. These stand out as a distinctive group in terms of matching appearance amongst an otherwise mix of property types and styles within the wider street scene and locality. Glen Rosa has previously been extended to the rear with a two-storey extension and which projects sideways in a deeply recessed position. The proposal includes a hip-to-gable change to the main roof with dormer windows to the front and rear.
4. The Council's *Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document* November 2011 (SPD) deals with roof extensions to existing buildings, including dormers. It advises that changes to the shape of a roof need to be carefully considered and that in the case of semi-detached properties or streets with very uniform roof design, significant alterations to the roof are generally unacceptable. It goes on to state that a dormer should not dominate the roof but should complement the existing features of the house in terms of proportion, size, position, and detailing, and that they should be kept well away from the ridge and edges of the roof in order to provide a visual frame.

5. The hip-to-gable change would significantly alter the form of the existing roof and symmetry of the original building. The rear dormer would be dependent upon the hip-to-gable change to accommodate its size and would cover the full width and height of the enlarged rear roof slope. The front dormer would similarly depend upon the hip-to-gable change to accommodate its size and would extend up to the height of the new, side projecting ridgeline, with no amount of separation or visual frame at this level. As a combination of roof extensions, the proposal as a whole appears to me to represent precisely the type of development the SPD advises against.
6. Notwithstanding, the Council accepts that the hip-to-gable change, along with the proposed rear dormer, could be undertaken as permitted development. I have no reason to doubt this, or to doubt that these works would most likely take place should the appeal fail. I give significant weight to this as a fallback position. Nevertheless, the 'box-like' front dormer would be a prominent roof addition that would dominate the front roof slope and would contribute in no small part to a change overall in the dwelling's roof profile that would be pronounced and unsympathetic to the simple form and modest proportions of the original roof. Its presence would also exaggerate the scale and visual impact of the proposed roof extensions overall, particularly in oblique views of the exposed side elevation of the property when approaching along Hamble Lane from the north.
7. Overall, and in the absence of any other front dormers to the similar identified properties within the group, I find that the proposed front dormer to Glen Rosa would be seen as an incongruous and intrusive addition that would be out of keeping with the pattern of development along this part of Hamble Lane. As such it would conflict with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan (2016-2036) by failing to display the quality of design that is required for development to avoid any unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the urban area. For the same reason there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.
8. Whilst notable change could take place to the appearance of the dwelling through permitted development, this does not justify the level of harm that I have identified through the inclusion of the proposed front dormer.
9. I have noted and carefully considered the appellant's need to accommodate his family's requirements, but this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of any objection from the parish council or any other interested parties, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR