

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/16/3159368

2A Branson Road, Bordon, Hampshire GU35 0EQ

- 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 James McCann against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 30573/008, dated 17 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to roof, remove dormer and increase ridge height, gable end to match existing, rendered blockwork to front elevation to form two separate dwellings (amendment to 30573/006).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to roof, remove dormer and increase ridge height, gable end to match existing, rendered blockwork to front elevation to form two separate dwellings at 2A Branson Road, Bordon, Hampshire GU35 0EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 30573/008, dated 17 June 2016, 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 drawings: Location & Block Plans; Proposed & Existing Floor Plans; Proposed & Existing Roof Plans and Side Elevations; and Proposed & Existing Front & Rear Elevations.
 - 3) No development shall start on site until plans and particulars showing details of the provisions of cycle storage within the site have been submitted and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the use of the development is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.
 - 4) No development shall start on site until plans and particulars showing provision for parking shall have been made within the site, including plans to alter the existing boundary wall, and subsequently maintained and kept available solely for that purpose have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.
 - 5) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the Proposed Elevations.
-

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Branson Road is a cul-de-sac to the east of the town centre containing two-storey short terraces and semi-detached post-war dwellings. Most of these are contemporaneous and have the same simple design with conventional dual pitched roofs, some with gabled and others with hipped ends.
4. The only buildings in the road which are of different design are two 2-storey blocks of flats, Jubilee House next to the turning head at the end of the road and No 12, and the appeal property which is located at the junction with Chalet Hill.
5. No 2A is a more modern infill two-storey house, which is slightly larger and about a metre higher than the surrounding houses. Permission was granted in 2006 for a first floor extension over the garage and single storey front extension to form two separate dwellings (LPA Ref 30573/006). I observed at the site visit that building work is currently proceeding although the first floor extension has clearly been built.
6. Two previous applications (30573/005 & 007) for the same works as now proposed were refused in 2005 and 2016. The two 2016 applications were refused for the same reasons, that the scale and bulk of the alterations would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. The Council argues that increasing the height of the first floor extension to the height of the building's main roof would increase No 2A's dominance of the street scene and that the resulting building would be incongruous and overbearing, particularly since No 2A sits forward of No 2.
8. However, I consider this objection to be overplayed. The size and height of No 2A is not significantly different to the sizes and heights of the surrounding dwellings including the adjacent terrace, and creating a gable end to the appeal building would simply match the design of its neighbour at No 2. The forward projection of No 2A beyond No 2 is minimal and the roof extension would not be out of character with or overbearing to the adjoining terrace.
9. I acknowledge that the appeal property is more prominent than the other dwellings on Branson Road because it lies at the junction. But it is set back from it by the wide diagonal grass verges and the gable extension would be on the opposite side facing north. Any views of it from Chalet Hill would only be oblique views and consequently would not be prominent.
10. For these reasons the proposed alterations including the gable end would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. Policy CP29 of the Joint Core Strategy requires development to be sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, massing and density, and its relationship to adjoining buildings, and spaces around buildings. For the above reasons the proposal would comply with this Policy.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested four conditions. A condition is necessary listing the approved drawings to provide certainty. Conditions are required reserving details of cycle parking and car parking in order to encourage sustainable modes of transport and ensure the development does not give rise to parking congestion or highway safety concerns respectively. An additional condition is also necessary to ensure that facing materials match those already used as set out on the Proposed Elevations.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR