

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/16/3165462

April Cottage, Drift Road, Whitehill, Bordon GU35 9DZ

- 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 Colin Smith and Ms J Brew against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 56099 was refused by notice dated 11 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension to an existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of this part of Drift Road.

Reasons

3. Drift Road is a residential street lined mainly by detached modern bungalows plus a few houses. April Cottage is a fairly typical bungalow, but notably has a tall, hipped roof, detached double garage to the front. The proposal would add 2 more bays to this garage, under a flat roof hidden behind a dummy pitched section.
 4. Due to its height and position, the existing garage is a prominent feature in the street scene, dominating views of the property despite the thick evergreen hedge on the site frontage. The proposed extension would nearly double the footprint of this outbuilding, bringing it close to the street. The roof form of the outbuilding as extended would be awkward, with the forward-most flat roofed section sitting uneasily next to the existing hipped roof section. I understand that this roof form has been chosen in order to keep the height down, but this would look contrived and would conflict with East Hampshire District Local Plan Second Review (LP) Policy HE2's statement that the roof form of any extension should respect the form of the original building.
 5. Although the new, low roof would largely be hidden behind the existing hedge, the outbuilding might well outlive that landscape feature. If the hedge was lost or lowered, the extended outbuilding would be clearly seen as a
-

disproportionately large, poorly designed and visually dominant feature in front of the bungalow.

6. I note that there are a few other garages in front of nearby dwellings, but saw none of the scale or design proposed here. I also take account of the support of some local residents. These matters do not outweigh my concern about the impact of this development on local character and appearance.
7. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of this section of Drift Road. It therefore conflicts with the aims of LP Policy HE2, Joint Core Strategy Policy CP29 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *Extending Your Home*, to ensure that extensions take account of the design, scale and character of the building, respecting local character, identity and context. It also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on securing high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness.
8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR