



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2024

by R Cahalane BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/24/3348347

245 Hursley Road, Chandler's Ford, Hampshire SO53 1JQ

- 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 and Mrs Mattoo against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/24/97154.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extensions with rear facing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site (No 245) comprises a detached bungalow located within an established residential area of Chandler's Ford. It is accessed off a small slip road parallel to Hursley Road, and is near to the junction with North Millers Dale. No 245 contains a detached single garage to its side that partially protrudes beyond the nearest front elevation of the main dwelling. It has a deep rear garden and the dwelling has a flat roof rear dormer.
4. No 245 and the other bungalows along the slip road are of modest scale. No 243 to the south is an extended bungalow with a longer ridgeline, but within a significantly wider plot. There are larger two storey and chalet style dwellings further away with more diverse sizes and designs, and large two-and-a-half storey apartment buildings at the other side of the Pine Road junction.
5. The single storey height of No 245 appears broadly similar to the more immediate bungalows at each side, which provide a positive rhythm and uniformity, despite these dwellings not being entirely identical in width or appearance. There are also significant gaps between the bungalows and the side boundaries, which allows for views of the mature trees beyond them. No 245 and its immediate surrounds have therefore retained a spacious and verdant setting along Hursley Road, and this is also clearly appreciable from the North Millers Dale junction opposite.
6. The proposed side extension would contain a full side gable end and an extended front gable end that would sit very close to the side boundary. This

siting and scale would disrupt the spacious rhythm of the row of bungalows to each side, even though the existing main dwelling ridge height would be retained. Whilst the increased width would bring the dwelling closer in line with that of No 243, the proximity to the side boundary would appear unacceptably cramped and would significantly harm the spacious feel of the site and its surroundings. Given that there is some variation in external material types along Hursley Road, the proposed use of white render for the external walls would not be harmful. This however does not mitigate the adverse visual impact arising from the siting of the proposed side extension.

7. The proposed rear dormer would be less visible from the road and would sit alongside the rear dormer of No 247 that is of broadly similar scale. The planning history and context of this neighbouring dormer is not before me. The Quality Spaces Supplementary Planning Document (QSSPD) specifically advises that a dormer should not dominate the roof and should complement the existing house features in terms of proportion, size and detailing, and be kept well away from the ridge and edges of the roof. Whilst the proposed dormer would be set in from the side edges of the main roof, it would adjoin the main ridge line and would also be flush with the rear eaves. Its scale would dominate the host dwelling and its non-matching materials would not complement the host dwelling and surrounding development.
8. The proposed single storey rear extension would not be readily visible from the public realm and the increased depth would not project significantly beyond neighbouring development. I have therefore found no harm in respect of this element of the proposal. The appellants state that the bulk of the overall rear extension could largely be achieved through the prior notification procedure due to the lack of neighbouring objection, and that a rear dormer could be built within the original roof under permitted development rights. However, there is no evidence before me to indicate that such developments would have a similar or greater visual impact than the appeal proposal. These suggested fallback options therefore do not justify granting planning permission for the current proposal.
9. The appellant contends that the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2022 (EBLP) does not firmly set out a requirement for subservient sized extensions. However, I have found the proposed side extension and rear dormer to be contrary to Policy DM1 of the EBLP. This policy requires, amongst other things, new development to avoid an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of urban areas and to take full and proper account of the context of the site, including the character and appearance of the locality in terms of mass, scale, layout, design and siting. The proposed rear dormer is also contrary to the abovementioned supporting guidance of the QSSPD.

Other Matters

10. The third reason for refusal refers to insufficient information provided to demonstrate that bats are not likely to be affected by the works. A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) has been provided with the appeal, which concludes that the house has no obvious roost features that could be used by bats at this time. However, the Council has not had an opportunity to review and comment on the PBRA. The Council's Ecologist also referred to potential impacts on other species in their initial consultation response due to the presence of trees and water features to the rear, which may require additional

consideration. As I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I do not need to consider these matters any further.

Planning Balance

11. I have assessed the appeal proposal on its own site-specific merits and have found that it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, contrary to the design requirements of Policy DM1 of the EBLP. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole.
12. The proposal would provide open plan living space for modern day family living and would provide more generously proportioned bedrooms without increasing the overall number of bedrooms. This may be akin to other consented developments in the area, although no specific layout examples are before me. There is also no evidence before me to demonstrate that the appeal proposal is the only, or least harmful way of providing for the needs of the appellants. The weight afforded to the benefits of the proposal in this regard is therefore limited, and does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. The appeal proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole, and the material considerations before me do not carry sufficient weight to indicate a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

R Cahalane

INSPECTOR