



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2024

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/23/3334002

Burlair, Botley Road, Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire SO50 7DQ

- 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 Sinclair against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/23/95399, dated 8 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension, interior and elevational changes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey rear extension, interior and elevational changes at Burlair, Botley Road, Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 7DQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref H/23/95399, dated 27 June 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Dwg No: 900 rev A – Location and Block Plan as Existing
 - Dwg No: D00 rev A – Location and Block Plan as Proposed
 - Dwg No: D01 rev C – Floor Plans as Proposed
 - Dwg No: D02 rev C – Elevations as Proposed
 - Dwg No: D03 rev C – Sections as Proposed
 - Dwg No: D04 rev A – Street Scene as Existing/Proposed
 - Dwg No: D05 – Roof Plan as Proposed
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows in the side elevations at the upper floor level have been fitted with obscured glazing. No part of those windows that are less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be

submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Sinclair against Eastleigh Borough Council. This is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. During the appeal, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) came into effect. However, the Framework's policy content insofar as it relates to the main issue in this case has not been significantly changed. Therefore, there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the new Framework. I am satisfied no party would be prejudiced by determining the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached chalet bungalow side dormer. Whilst the immediate neighbouring properties comprise single-storey and 1.5-storey bungalows, the predominant building height in the surrounding area is two storeys. Aside from the prevalence of detached properties sited within generously sized plots, the continuity of building age, types, scale, design and architectural features in the area is limited.
6. The proposed development would provide a significant increase in floor space in comparison with the existing property. However, it would not extend beyond the existing side building lines at the ground or upper floor level, and the raised roof height would be lower than the neighbouring property known as Conifer. Due to the wide plot frontage of the site and its neighbouring properties, the extended dwelling, therefore, would not dominate its immediate neighbours, nor the street scene as a whole.
7. The gable end front projection, a prominent feature in the façade of the existing property, would be retained. The increased roof height would provide a bigger offset between the upper floor window and the eaves, resulting in a less cramped arrangement. The façade would be further enhanced by the proposed gable roof above the entrance which would have a similar angle to the existing gable.
8. To the rear, additions at the ground and upper floor level would increase the depth of the existing property. Whilst the increase is substantial to the upper floor, the flat roof sections ensure the dominance of the sloped roof remains, extending from the gable end frontage to an accentuated gable end feature on the rear elevation. The proportions and features of rear elevation are further enhanced through consistency in height, roof angles and a contemporary fenestration arrangement.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh

Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (the Local Plan). This policy states that new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance, amongst other things, the character and appearance of urban areas. I find no conflict with the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document which sets out the key design principles which contribute to well-designed development. Additionally, the appeal scheme would not conflict with the Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that development is carried out following the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
11. I have also imposed a condition requiring the use of materials to match those used in the existing property, in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area.
12. To protect the privacy of occupiers of the extended dwelling and neighbouring properties, I have attached a condition requiring the upper floor windows on the side elevations to be fitted with obscured glass. The standard of glass doesn't need to be stipulated to make this condition precise or enforceable. Furthermore, as drafted, it will enable the main parties to agree on the most suitable standard based on best practices at the time of discharging the condition.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR