



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2019

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/19/3232255

24A 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 Ms H Willis & Mr I Shafiq against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/00527/HOU dated 7 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey/single storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey/single storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 24A Kingsley Road, Eversley, Hook RG27 0LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/00527/HOU dated 7 March 2019, 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: red line location plan; 832/01 and 832/03A.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Appellant submitted a corrected plan (832/03A) with the appeal submission; this corrected the proposed rear roof line which had been incorrectly shown. I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by me accepting this plan but for the sake of completeness, the plan has been sent to the Council with an invitation to submit any comments it may wish to make. No further representations have been received.
3. A copy of a recent appeal decision at the adjoining property, No 24 Kingsley Road granting permission for a 2 storey rear extension with internal alterations following the demolition of the rear extension (APP/N1730/D/19/3230745

dated 14 August 2019) has been forwarded to me by the Appellant. I have provided the Council with the appeal decision and invited them to submit any comments in relation to that decision. No representations have been received.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and on the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling and was granted permission in 2010 under the Council's reference 10/02702/FUL, changing the previous semi-detached pair of Nos 23 and 24 to a short terrace of 3 dwellings. The property is situated on the west side of the road which is characterised by both two storey dwellings and bungalows, all set in good sized grounds with generous spacing between the pairs of dwellings, many of which have been extended, including to the side. Open, playing fields to the immediate north and west of the appeal property serve the adjoining primary school.
6. The proposal would extend with a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The side extension would be of modest width with its roof line set down from the main ridge line. The front elevation would include for a front door under a pitched roof porch. The side elevation facing the school playing fields would extend the existing side gable closer to the boundary, with a cat slide roof to the remaining extension. At the rear the further single storey extension would be of modest depth under a pitched roof.
7. Given their modest dimensions, taken individually and together, I consider that both the side and rear extensions would appear as subordinate additions to the main dwelling. Their proportions and design would also respect the character and form of the existing property and would add visual interest to the front elevation with the inclusion of a front bay window and front door with porch.
8. Many of the existing properties have been extended with a variety of designs, and I consider that the proposal before me would appear as a modest addition which would be assimilated into the street scene. Although it would bring development closer to the side (northern boundary) it would not appear cramped in the street scene, given the adjoining open playing fields. There is an irregular rear elevation across the terrace as existing and I do not consider that the proportions and design of the proposals would result in the appeal property appearing overly dominant in relation to its neighbours.
9. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the street scene. There would be no conflict with Policies GEN1, GEN4 and RUR24 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to Section 12, all of which seek a good quality of design which respects the local context.
10. Each proposal must be judged on its individual merits, but I have nonetheless had regard to the recent appeal decision at the adjoining property. I have found nothing in that decision which conflicts with the decision I have reached in this case.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. In terms of conditions, I agree with the Council that the materials should match those used on the existing building in order to protect the character and appearance of the existing building and local area. A condition should be imposed to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR