



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2019

by Martin S. Lee, MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/W/18/3217662

Rondor, 1 Green Way, Basingstoke RG22 6PB

- 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 Quigley against the decision of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02457/HSE, dated 16 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of second storey extension above existing garage and loft conversion into additional living space
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. As a brick built, semi-detached, two storey property beneath a hipped roof in common with its neighbour, the existing dwellinghouse forms a balanced scale and design of structure with that neighbour.
4. The proposed development would principally comprise two linked elements of works in the form of a first-floor side extension and a rear dormer roof extension. The Council accept that whilst the form of the proposed first floor side extension would incorporate a change from a hipped to gable end resulting in an unbalanced appearance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings, this would not in itself warrant the refusal of planning permission as the detailed design and scale of the side extension would not result in a significant detrimental impact. This is a conclusion with which I would agree and therefore the appeal focusses on the rear dormer roof extension.
5. The rear of the property is clearly visible and quite prominent to private views from residential gardens behind and to either side, but also to open public view from Old Worting Road. The proposed dormer window would be clearly seen in the context of the current and neighbouring built form and it's incongruity of scale and form compared with its most immediate neighbour, and the local surroundings would be exacerbated by its visibility. Flat roof dormers are not a characteristic or prevailing feature of the surrounding area and the proposal does not comply with the design guidance given within Section 11 'Extensions' of the

Council's Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (the SPD) which advises that flat roof designs should be avoided.

6. The current proposal would, therefore, clearly detract quite substantially from the existing character of the host building its attached partner and the local area and, therefore, be contrary to Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (the Local Plan), Section 11 'Extensions' of the SPD, and Section 12 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which all seek to ensure development is visually attractive, of high quality design and contributes positively to local distinctiveness adding to overall quality of the area. Whilst I have also noted the reference within the reason for refusal to the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan, the Council has subsequently clarified that this reference was made in error, and I have therefore disregarded it in my decision-making.

Other Matters

7. I have noted the differences between the current proposal and an earlier scheme previously considered on appeal (APP/H1705/D/18/3200478), together with the conclusions and reasoning provided in that Inspector's decision letter, particularly with reference to the Framework, Policy EM10 of the Local Plan, and Section 11 'Extensions' of the SPD. Whilst I accept that the current proposal represents a substantial reduction in one element of the previous appeal proposal, namely the width of the flat roof dormer proposed at second floor level. However, for the reasons set out, I do not regard the revised form and scale to be appropriate despite the reduction in width, and it does not materially alter the adverse visual impact of the proposal.
8. I have also had regard to the appellant's argument that rather than apply for separate prior approvals at different stages of the development they wish to secure one single planning permission in order to simplify the development process. In this respect I have had regard to the current provisions of the Town & Country (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (As Amended) in relation to extensions and roof alterations to dwellings.
9. However, whether this may be the case, the appeal before me relates to works applied for under a planning application in their entirety, and I have not been provided with any conclusive detail that all of the various elements would in their proposed form be capable of implementation as permitted development. This is a matter that would need to be resolved through the appropriate procedure and I have not therefore attached any significant weight to it.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons give above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin S. Lee

INSPECTOR