

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/N1730/D/16/3157496

10 Andrews Close, Church Crookham, Fleet, Hampshire, GU52 6HF.

- 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 Jason Baker against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application, ref: 16/01276/HOU, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey front extension and new raised roof to existing rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) The effect of the proposed alterations upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
 - b) The impact of the two storey side extension upon the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of 12 Andrews Close.

Reasons

- a) *Effect upon character and appearance.*
3. 10 Andrews Close comprises a detached, post-war bungalow located within an area of similar properties.
 4. A number of the bungalows have been the subject of alterations in order to create accommodation within their roof spaces. These include no. 14 at the head of the cul-de-sac, which incorporates dormer windows to both flank roof slopes. Other bungalows nearby in Award Road have been converted to two storey houses. All of these properties were noted during my site visit.
 5. No. 10, which occupies a large plot, has been extended in the past by means of a large single storey addition and other minor alterations. It is proposed to utilise an area of open space at the side of the bungalow in order to combine these rather disparate extensions and create a large family home.
-

6. The works to 14 Andrews Close have not resulted in an increase in the footprint of the dwelling. By contrast, the scheme before me would involve the erection of a new two storey structure to the side of the property sited almost entirely in front of the building line of no. 12 next door, with a ridge height above that of the original bungalow. Its size and height would represent a bulky addition to the existing, rather modest bungalow as viewed from the street.
7. The two storey extension would be flush with the front elevation of the existing bungalow and, as a result, would not appear subservient to the host building. It would extend the front elevation to an overall width of almost 15m, which is much greater than that of any of the bungalows that are clustered around the hammerhead of Andrews Close. Furthermore, given its forward projection the plain rendered southeast elevation would be highly prominent within the street scene.
8. For all of these reasons I have found upon the first main issue that the design, siting and format of the proposed two storey side extension would be out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area. As such, development as proposed would be contrary to "saved" Policies GEN 1 (i) and URB 16 (i) and (iii) of the Local Plan¹.

b) Impact upon living conditions.

9. The two storey extension would be sited almost entirely in front of the adjacent bungalow at no. 12. Although the appeal site is at a lower level, given its bulk and height to eaves the new structure would nevertheless appear as an over-bearing and dominant feature as viewed from the front garden and front-facing window of that property.
10. Neither the existence of an established brick boundary wall between nos. 10/12 nor the off-set of the two storey extension from the common boundary would be sufficient to compensate for the loss of amenity that would arise by virtue of such a dominant and highly visible structure.
11. I therefore find upon the second main issue that the two storey side extension would, by reason of its siting, design and scale, unacceptably impact upon the outlook and residential amenity of existing and future occupiers of 12 Andrews Close and that development as proposed would be contrary to "saved" Policy URB 16 (ii) of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

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

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

¹ The Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 (April 2009).