

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/17/3167922

187 Greenfield Crescent, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 9ER

- 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 Mr & Mrs J & C Pycroft & Hinton against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 56962, dated 3 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey extensions to side and rear to provide annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a single storey extension to the side to provide an annexe.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted insofar as it relates to a single storey rear extension at 187 Greenfield Crescent, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 9ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 56962, dated 3 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans solely insofar as they directly relate to the approved works: Location plan; 4578/500 - block plan; 4578/200 - roof plan; 4578/1 - existing ground floor plan; 4578/2 - existing elevations; 4578/3 - proposed ground floor plan; 4578/4 Rev A - proposed elevations; and 4578/5 - cross section.

Preliminary Matters

3. I use the Council's description which is more precise; I note the Appellants also use this on the appeal form.
 4. I consider that there are two principal and distinct parts of the proposal; one extension to the rear and one extension to the side of the appeal property. I therefore would be able to issue a split decision in this case.
-

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached bungalow of pleasing modest proportions and elevations which are reflective of the most properties locally on this sizeable estate of established residential character. The similar properties and their gardens come together to form an area of agreeable suburban appearance. The appeal plot is on a corner and prominent as a result. The proposal is as described above and embodies a pitched roof side extension, following garage demolition, with living, kitchenette, bedroom and en suite space and a smaller lower pitched roof rear extension to form a household dining room.

Side extension

Character and appearance

7. In relation to the existing property the side extension would appear as a relatively major addition. Even with a set-back from the front elevation the additional width would look strangely extensive and dominant of the existing property and this would be exacerbated by the full roof height joining to the existing ridge. Seen from the rear, down the side street, the structure would come overly forward of what is albeit an irregular building line and would appear out of place. The long flank of the extension would be too extensive and too close the side road and would negatively decrease the pleasing sense of space and landscape which is found on this and most other corner positions locally. In simple terms, and in all dimensions, the proposed extension would be too large. It would fail to have sufficient regard to the constraints of the site and the need to be subservient to the existing property.
8. CP29 of the Joint Core Strategy and Saved Policy HE2 of the Local Plan, taken together and amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, sympathetic to its host property and surroundings, suitable in scale and layout, and protective of local distinctiveness. This is reflected in the advice and objectives of the Council's SPG on Residential Extensions albeit that document cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the guidance.

Other matters

9. I sympathise with the Appellants' wish to increase the scope of accommodation at this property and particularly the health reasons which have given rise to the scheme. I appreciate that the proposal would not raise concerns over amenity for neighbours and that no local residents have objected and neither has the Parish Council. It is unfortunate that the Appellants seemingly had difficulty accessing Council documents and I understand that there would have been some willingness to make modifications. I do however have to determine the scheme before me. This is a relatively wide site and I can see the thought that has gone into some aspects of the design and detailing although I do find the overall plans to be over-ambitious in this instance. I say this aware of the 'permitted development' scenario which is put by the Appellants but is not

before me and, as the Appellants fairly say, effectively has restrictions applying to corner properties. I noted other extensions drawn to my attention but found none to be directly comparable by reason of their design, siting or scale and in any event I must determine the scheme before me on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellants but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.

10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the objectives of the development plan policies which I cite mirror aims of this document.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the single storey side extension would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal for this is dismissed.

Rear extension

12. The Council raises concern over the cumulative impact of this element when added to the larger side extension but makes little or no direct criticism of this modest structure in its own right. The Council incorrectly states that this component would have the same roof height as the main property when the plans show it would be appreciable lower and hence visually subservient. To my mind given design, siting and scale there would be no character or appearance difficulties associated with this rear extension as planned. I conclude that there would be development plan policy compliance and thus the appeal should be allowed in this regard.
13. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with a requirement for works to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I agree with this as it provides certainty. A condition relating to matching materials is also sought which would be in the interests of visual amenity. This dining room extension to the main dwelling would not form part of the Appellants' wish for an annexe and thus there is no need for the Council's suggested occupation and separation restrictions.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR