The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2011

by Sheila Holden BSc MSc CEng TPP MICE MRTPI FCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/11/2157699
52 Lone Valley, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO7 5EB

- 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 J Measham against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
- The application Ref APP/11/00346, dated 24 March 2011, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2011.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion incorporating dormer windows and roof lights.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The application form did not include a description of the proposal. However, the Council described it as a loft conversion incorporating dormer windows and roof lights and I have dealt with the appeal on the same basis.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Lone Valley is part of a residential estate that is predominantly characterised by detached and semi-detached bungalows. Although they vary in style it would appear that some had flat-roofed front facing dormer windows incorporated in their original designs. No. 52 is a small, detached bungalow on a corner site and is therefore in a prominent position. It is adjacent to a pair of two-storey semi-detached properties and, with the exception of No. 54, is otherwise surrounded by properties that differ from it in style. The proposal is to insert a dormer window in the front roof slope with a false hipped roof.

5. On my site visit I saw dormers with pitched, mono-pitched and hipped style roofs. However, none in the vicinity was directly comparable with the design of the appeal proposal. Where there were dormer windows with flat roofs their roofs were below the ridge of the host property. However, with the appeal proposal the false hipped roof would protrude from the existing ridge, significantly increasing the overall height of the dormer. It would therefore appear more bulky and would dominate the roof slope rather than sitting within

it. Its additional height and bulk would be particularly apparent when viewed alongside the neighbouring property, No. 54, which already has a dormer window with a flat roof in its front roof slope. This would be especially noticeable since these two properties share the same basic design.

6. I conclude that the proposed dormer window would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the form and design of its roof. It would therefore be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Core Strategy, adopted 2011, which seeks high quality design that respects it setting. I consider this to be the case notwithstanding the presence of dormers of different shapes and sizes in other properties.

7. I acknowledge that the proposed dormer window would sit above the eaves level and the fenestration would match that of the existing house and in this respect, it would be of appropriate proportions in relation to the size of the host property. However, these positive aspects of the proposal do no diminish the harm arising from the shape and style of the roof. I therefore find nothing to alter my conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR