
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/17/3172727

4 Greyshott Laurels, Lindford, Bordon GU35 0QB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Venning against East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 52699/001, is dated 23 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension following demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey front extension following demolition of existing garage at 4 Greyshott Laurels, Lindford, Bordon GU35 0QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 52699/001, dated 23 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-01 existing plans & elevations and PL-02 proposed plans & elevations.
 - 3) The external materials to be used shall match, as closely as possible, in type, colour, and texture those of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has confirmed that had it determined the planning application it would have been refused. The Council's concerns relate to the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing house and surrounding area, the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, particularly concerning the effect on their privacy and outlook, and the effect of loss of the garage on parking provision and how that would affect highway safety.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area;

- the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of 2, 8 and 10 Greyshott Laurels with particular regard to privacy and outlook; and
- the effect of the proposed loss of garage on highway safety with regard to the adequacy of parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Greyshott Laurels comprises a residential development of predominantly detached houses of matching design that are two storeys with a single storey projection to the front that contains a double garage. The existing projection at no. 4 currently has a front door and garage door facing the drive with a blank side wall, and door and small garage window on the projection's rear elevation. For these reasons, the additional articulation using windows and a low eaves line would result in an attractive addition to the property. Given that low eaves line and taking account that this would replace the existing single storey front projection, the proposed extension would remain subservient to the main two storey element of the existing house despite being to the front of it.
5. Few of the surrounding similar houses have been significantly altered, those that have first floor extensions above their garages are set back from the road and obscured by planting, such that they are not easily visible from the road. Some single storey front projections are very prominent when viewed from the road, that at no. 2 is particularly so in the approach from the main road, no. 4 is prominent directly in front of the approach in the opposite direction, especially given the layout and proximity to no. 21 opposite.
6. However, it is necessary to balance the prominence of the location with the attractiveness of the proposed development. The appearance of the extension would better relate to the road and turning area that wraps around the extension and the main two storey element of the building than the existing projection. This would outweigh the prominence of the proposed development on the road. Overall, the proposal would make a positive contribution to the appearance of the area.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, it would comply with Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (LP) and Policy CP29 of the Joint Core Strategy (CS) that requires development to respect the character, identity and context of built up areas, including seeking exemplary standards of design that takes account of the design, scale and character of the original building.

Living conditions

8. The layout of the estate means that 8 and 10 Grayshott Laurels are set back from the road and at an angle to the proposed development. This means that the front of those dwellings face toward the front projection of no. 4. The first floor of the extension would contain two windows, one of which would be a bathroom window that is likely to be obscure glazed, the other serving a bedroom. Whilst these would face toward these neighbouring dwellings, they are some 9m away and at an acute angle. Consequently, the proposed

windows would not result in overlooking of those properties or loss of privacy to occupiers of those dwellings.

9. The additional height would make the front projection more prominent in views from those dwellings. However, it is limited with the eaves below those of the main dwelling. Given the separation and location at an angle to the front of those dwellings, it would not result in an overbearing effect on the living conditions of those neighbouring occupiers.
10. 2 Grayshott Laurels is set further from the road than no. 4, such that the extension would be further forward than the equivalent projection on the neighbouring property. Whilst the first floor windows would overlook part of the front garden and over the roof of the neighbouring property, this would not cause harm to the living conditions of occupiers of that dwelling.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not materially affect the privacy or outlook of neighbouring occupiers, so would not materially harm their living conditions. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policy HE2 of the LP and Policy CP27 of the CS that seek to ensure development would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Highway safety

12. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing double garage and the replacement front projection would not contain a replacement garage. As a result, the proposed development would include the removal of two parking spaces at the property. However, the driveway currently contains space to the front of the property for two cars to park, with additional space to the front of the projection, resulting in space for three cars to park, as well as the garage.
13. The Council have confirmed that their parking requirements for a five bedroom house would be three parking spaces. As none of the existing spaces outside the garage would be lost, I conclude that the proposal would provide sufficient parking to meet Council requirements.
14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed loss of the garage would not adversely affect highway safety given that adequate parking provision would remain at the property. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policy T9 of the LP, Policy CP31 of the CS and the Framework that require provision of adequate, convenient and secure vehicle parking.

Conditions

15. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for materials to match those used on the existing house to maintain the character and appearance of the area. In some cases I have amended the wording of conditions suggested by the Council in the interests of clarity.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons and taking into account all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

AJ Steen INSPECTOR