

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: 29th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/16/3164918

Cardinals, Station Approach, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5HN

- 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 Simon Warren against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 55832/001, dated 11 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new 3 bed detached chalet style dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is formed from the end half of the rear garden of Cardinals, a detached bungalow which is located on the corner of Winston Rise and Station Approach. The immediate surrounding area to the appeal site comprises a mix of housing. There are, however, obvious patterns of development. Winston Rise is predominantly characterised by low bungalows whilst adjacent properties in Station Approach are more generally two storeys. Properties in both roads, in the main, enjoy relatively spacious plots with good sized rear gardens.
 4. Also of note is Freshwater Terrace which is a new development just opposite the appeal site. It includes a bungalow, chalet style properties and two storey properties and has been designed to create a transition between the lower bungalows in Winston Rise and the higher two storey houses in Station Approach. The higher density of this development also means the plot sizes are markedly smaller than those of adjacent properties. Freshwater Terrace is, however, a well-considered development which, whilst having its own distinctive character, nevertheless responds well to its surroundings.
 5. The appeal site would address Winston Rise and a chalet style dwelling is proposed. This would sit between two very low bungalows with low eaves and either hipped or very low pitched roofs; Cardinals to the north and 1a Winston Rise to the south. The proposed chalet property with its gable ended roof, dormer windows, and higher eaves would sit uncomfortably between the
-

bungalows either side of it appearing overly bulky and out of character.

Although there are chalet style properties opposite in Freshwater Terrace the proposed dwelling would not visually form a part of this, sitting on its own and on the other side of the road. Consequently it would appear as a disjointed form of development which would be harmful to the streetscene.

6. In addition to the above, the proposed chalet style dwelling would sit entirely forward of No 1a which would make it all the more prominent and create further discord to the character and appearance of the area. I also share the Council's concerns with respect to the subdivision of Cardinals which would result in significantly smaller plot sizes and limited rear gardens for both the existing and proposed dwelling when compared to properties in area generally. Whilst I acknowledge that there are smaller plot sizes in Freshwater Terrace, as noted above the proposed dwelling would not visually form a part of this. I therefore find that the proposed development would be uncharacteristic of the overriding pattern of development in the area.
7. Taking the above points together the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy CP29 of The East Hampshire District Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) which requires new development to respect an area's particular characteristics and be appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of its scale, density, and the spaces around buildings. I also find conflict with Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan (2016) which seeks to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens where this would lead to harm to local character.
8. The appellant refers to alterations to Jelna on Station Approach to change it from a bungalow to a chalet style property, and new dwellings built to the rear of Wildacres, also on Station Approach, to justify the proposal. However, both are viewed in the context of Station Approach not Winston Rise and as such do not provide an immediate context to the appeal site. The same is true of development in the wider area referred to by the appellant.
9. I understand the appellant's frustration at receiving a refusal of planning permission given that pre-application discussions were favourable and that numerous changes were made to the proposal based on the advice of planning officers. This does not, however, affect my impartial consideration of the planning merits of the case. Finally, whilst I acknowledge that the proposed dwelling would be energy efficient and incorporate sustainable design elements this would not outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR