

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2017

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/17/3174156

10 Park Lane, Old Basing, RG24 7HE

- 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 Miss L Salmon against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04591/HSE, dated 9 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part 2-storey, part single-storey rear extension, 2-storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of part 2-storey, part single-storey rear extension, 2-storey side extension and front porch at 10 Park Lane, Old Basing, RG24 7HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04591/HSE, dated 9 December 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos 01, 02, 03, 04 and 05.
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) The windows at first floor level on the southern elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be non-opening and glazed with obscured glass. Once installed the windows shall be permanently maintained in that condition.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed at first floor level or above on the northern or southern elevations of the development hereby permitted.
-

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and upon the living conditions at 11 Park Lane with particular regard to visual impact and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house set within a run of detached and semi-detached dwellings of various ages and designs, all recessed fairly deeply back from their frontages to Park Lane.
4. The Council accepts that the proposed side extension would leave sufficient gap with the neighbouring property at No 11 such that there would be no unacceptable terracing effect within the street scene. I have no reason to disagree. Nevertheless, they are concerned that the proposed extensions would fail to display any subservience to the original property and as a result would appear over-dominant and harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and wider area.
5. The two-storey side extension would be of only limited width and would be recessed slightly behind the dwelling's front elevation, with a ridge height that would be set slightly lower than the existing ridge line. When viewed from Park Lane, I find that its set back and lowered form would ensure that it would appear appropriately subservient and sympathetic to the existing dwelling and in accord with the advice for side extensions contained within the Council's *Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document: Extending Your Home and Replacement Dwellings* (SPD), adopted February 2012.
6. Although the extension would increase the scale and bulk of the dwelling's side elevation by a fairly significant amount, this would be largely undetected within the street scene due to the limited opportunity that would be had to view the rear part of the extension through the gap between Nos 10 and 11. In addition, I saw a number of nearby properties with reasonably deep two-storey projections to the rear, these being visible not only from the rear garden of the appeal property but also in views from Park Lane through some of the larger gaps between some neighbouring properties. In none of these cases did any of the dwellings appear out of scale or incongruous amongst the mixed architecture within their setting. In this instance I am satisfied that the extension overall would appear appropriately domestic in scale and proportionate to the original dwelling without harm to the character or visual amenity of the area.

Living Conditions at 11 Park Lane

7. I saw that No 11 has been extended to the side at two-storey and to the rear with a single-storey addition across its entire width. The appeal proposal would extend No 10 at two-storey to a depth more or less equivalent to the depth of the single-storey rear extension to No 11. The extension would therefore be out of sight in the outlook from the rear facing ground floor windows to No 11, which would equally be unaffected by any loss of light.

8. I appreciate that the extension would be seen at an angle in reasonably close proximity in the outlook from the nearest first floor window to No 11, which is within the extended part of that property. This would limit the view from this window obliquely across the rear garden of No 10 and beyond to some degree. However, there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that there would be any serious loss of light to this nearest window, the direct outlook from which would more generally remain fairly expansive across the property's own reasonably deep rear garden. The outlook from the other rear facing first floor windows would be largely unaffected.
9. The appeal property is located to the north and slightly east of No 11. As a consequence there would be little chance of the extension causing any significant overshadowing of No 11. In this regard I find no direct conflict with the guidelines contained within the SPD.
10. Whilst I accept that the extension would be clearly seen from No 11, it would appear as a well-considered and seamless part of the neighbouring property. It would have little impact of any significance such that overall I am satisfied that the proposal would be neither overbearing nor intrusive.

Conditions

11. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure that the extension is built with materials that would match the existing. To safeguard the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers to each side, it is necessary to control any windows at first floor level, limiting those proposed to non-opening and obscure glazing, and restricting the insertion of any windows in future.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area, or to the living conditions at 11 Park Lane. As such, there would be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy EM10 *Delivering High Quality Development* of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029. Neither do I find conflict with National Planning Policy Framework as it relates to such matters. The Council's decision notice makes reference to the *Old Basing and Lychpit Village Design Statement 2005* but my attention has not been drawn to conflict with any specific part of this document. Therefore, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR