

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2016

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/16/3158009

37 Highland Drive, Oakley, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG23 7LF.

- 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 W Burton against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application, ref: 16/00635/HSE, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of garage in rear garden and demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) The effect of the proposed replacement garage upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
 - b) The impact of the scheme upon the living conditions of nearby residents.

Reasons

- a) *Effect upon character and appearance.*
3. 37 Highland Drive comprises a modest, semi-detached post-war house located within an area of similar properties. The existing single garage, which is sited just beyond the rear elevation of the house, would be demolished and a garage with low pitch roof erected to span the entire width of the rear garden.
 4. At the time of my site visit the garden had been excavated to facilitate erection of the garage given the sloping nature of the site. The reduced level of the oversite would minimise the visual impact of the replacement garage as viewed from the properties to the rear.
 5. Notwithstanding these comments, once the existing garage has been removed the new building would be clearly visible from Highland Drive. It would have a footprint greater than that of the host building and, with its pitched roof and roof lights, would appear as a dominant and incongruous structure that would
-

be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

6. For these reasons, I have found upon the first main issue that development as proposed would be contrary to the requirements of Policy EM10 of the Local Plan¹ and Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework².

b) Impact upon living conditions.

7. Having regard to the depth of the excavation that has been undertaken, it is probable that only the very top of the wall and the low pitch roof of the garage would be visible from the houses to the rear.
8. The existing boundary treatment to the flank of the garden would effectively screen the proposed structure from the adjacent houses on either side (nos. 35 and 39) and would reduce any noise associated with vehicles utilising the new garage.
9. I therefore find upon the second main issue that development as proposed would not have an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of nearby residents, as required by Policy EM10 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

10. I have noted the recommendation of Council Officers that planning permission should be granted, both in the original Case Officer's report and the Committee update. Notwithstanding this fact and my finding upon the second main issue, my concerns as to the size and bulk of the replacement garage are paramount.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

¹ The Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011 to 2029): adopted May 2016.

² The National Planning Policy Framework.