The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2017

**by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 9 June 2017**

**Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/17/3169820**
**21 Thrush Close, Basingstoke, RG22 5PZ**

- 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 Cottis against the decision of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council.
- The application Ref 16/03645/HSE, dated 3 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2017.
- The development proposed is a second storey side extension.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the street scene.

## Reasons

3. Thrush Close is comprised largely of two storey link detached properties which were built in the 1960s. The houses all share a similar design aesthetic, one of the defining features being the flat roof garages which separate them. Therefore, whilst many of the properties adjoin, the single storey nature of the garages provides separation between the houses and gives a feeling of space. 21 and 19 Thrush Close is an example of this being linked only by their garages which provides a large gap between the houses themselves.

4. It is proposed to erect an extension over the garage at No 21 right up to the shared boundary with No 19. This would significantly reduce the gap between Nos 19 and 21 created by No 19's garage which would, as a result, erode the spacious character of the Close. The detailed design of the extension would also lack a set down from the main ridgeline and a set back from the main front elevation which would make it a relatively bulky and dominant side extension. As set out in Appendix 13 of the Council's Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Extending your Home and Replacement Dwellings, set back and lowered extensions appear more sympathetic and subservient to the main house.

5. In addition to the above, whilst each application and appeal must be treated on its individual merits, I can appreciate the Council's concern that approval of this proposal could be used in support of similar schemes in Thrush Close. This is a realistic and specific concern as so many of the properties here are separated only by the space above their linking garages. Therefore, similar developments

to that proposed would cumulatively completely alter the character of Thrush Close as the properties would lose their spacious appearance and begin to merge into one another.

6. I appreciate the appellant wishes to extend his home in a similar manner to others in Close, referring specifically to first floor side extensions over 20 and 22 Thrush Close. I have not been provided with full details of these so am unable to make any meaningful comparisons. However, the few examples of first floor side extensions that there are have not significantly altered the character of the Close to such a degree so as to justify the proposal given the harm I have found. 12 Swallow Close is also referred to but this does not provide an immediate context to the appeal site.

7. Taking the above points together the proposed extension would be harmful to the street scene and as such would conflict with policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029) which requires development to, amongst other things, positively contribute to the existing street scene. It would also conflict with the SPD which highlights that the spaces between buildings can make an important contribution to the character of an area and that extensions which reach a property's boundary may contribute towards an inappropriate terracing effect, particularly where a neighbouring property could also be extended in a similar manner.

8. For these reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*Hayley Butcher*

INSPECTOR