

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/19/3230745
24 Kingsley Road, Eversley, Hook RG27 0LZ

- 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 & Mrs S Jones against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application, Ref. 19/00234/HOU, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension with internal alterations following the demolition of the rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey rear extension with internal alterations following the demolition of the rear extension at 24 Kingsley Road, Eversley, Hook RG27 0LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 19/00234/HOU, dated 25 February 2019, 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Project No. 2756: Drawing Nos. 010 P2; 011 P2; 020 P1; 021 P5; 022 P2; 040 P2; 041 P5;
 - 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 23 as regards outlook.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, the size and bulk of the proposed two storey extension is substantial and bearing in mind that the host dwelling is a mid-terrace property the Council's concern appears at first sight to be reasonable.
 4. However, both Nos. 23 and 24a to either side already have significant extensions and the effect of these on the rear elevation of the terrace as a
-

whole is such as to result in a somewhat ad hoc and disjointed appearance of no particular merit.

5. Bearing this in mind, together with the Council's acknowledgement that the addition would not be visible from the public realm, I do not consider the assertion in the first reason for refusal that the extension would be '*to the detriment of the appearance of the host property*' to be particularly persuasive. The rear of No. 24 can only be seen in the context of the rear elevations of the adjoining properties and in addition the gable design would be similar to that at No. 24a.
6. On balance, I conclude on this issue that the effect on the appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole would be more neutral than harmful and any conflict with Policies GEN1 & GEN4 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 (Saved Policies) would not be such as to warrant the withholding of permission.
7. On the second issue, the Council argues that the 6m depth of the two storey extension would result in an overbearing appearance in the outlook from the rear of No. 23. However, the extension would project no further than No. 23's existing single storey extension along the boundary and the roof would slope away from this neighbour's garden. I also note that the occupier of No. 23 has stated that she has no objection to the proposal and although in itself this is not determinative it is nonetheless a material consideration.
8. On this issue I conclude that there would be no harm caused to the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 23 as regards outlook and therefore no conflict with Local Plan Policy GEN1.
9. On both issues, I additionally conclude that there would not be a material conflict with Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. A condition stipulating matching external materials will safeguard visual amenity. The Council has also suggested a parking condition, but as I see no prospect of the three spaces in the front curtilage being used for any purpose other than the parking of the occupiers' cars, I do not consider this to be necessary.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR

