



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/19/3232612

5 Stevens Green, St Mary Bourne SP11 6DF

- 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 Iain Jones against the decision of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00471/HSE, dated 14 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, loft conversion and replacement detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the replacement detached garage. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and loft conversion and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and loft conversion at 5 Stevens Green, St Mary Bourne SP11 6DF. This is in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/00471/HSE, dated 14 February 2019, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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, in so far as it relates to the single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and loft conversion only shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Floor plans and elevations Drawing No 01, Proposed single storey extensions and loft conversion – Existing and proposed elevations compared Drawing No 02, Proposed single storey extensions and replacement detached garage-ground floor and garden plans Drawing No 03, Proposed loft conversion-floor plans and elevations Drawing No 04, Block Plan Drawing No 6 and Location Plan Drawing No 7.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. For the reasons that follow, I find the single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and loft conversion to be acceptable and they are clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed replacement detached garage. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and loft conversion.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the (i) character and appearance of the area and (ii) St Mary Bourne and Stoke Conservation Area including protected trees.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large semi-detached property and located on a corner plot on Stevens Green with a large front garden with a wooden shed on the eastern boundary of the front garden. It is located in a residential area with varying styles of properties. Properties in the street are set back with front gardens and typically hedgerows bordering the pavement. This gives the area a pleasant feel.
5. The Council consider the single storey extensions and proposed loft conversion are acceptable in their design and are sympathetic to the existing property and they do not adversely impact on the character and appearance of the area. I would agree and consider the single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion as acceptable additions to the property and the streetscene and do not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. However, the Council consider the proposed detached garage, being sited further forward of the dwelling on land which currently exists a wooden shed would appear an incongruous feature in the street scene and which departs from the existing building line. The Council indicate the shed is unauthorised and does not benefit from planning permission. Further I note this is not a permanent structure and could be removed.
7. The property is situated on a prominent corner plot at the end of Stevens Green. The shed is a notable feature given its position front of the building line which is out of character with surrounding properties. However, it is also evident that the shed has been sited to the front of the property for a considerable period of time. Historically, this property was at the end of a cul de sac with garages having been demolished to make way for the through road serving the more recent development of Hirst Close. These garages were demolished a considerable time ago and do not form part of the character and appearance of the area now and accordingly I give this little weight.
8. The Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018) identifies that garages that depart from a defined building line, may appear incongruous in the streetscene. There is an established building line along this road and the shed appears out of context with this pattern of development. The introduction of a permanent larger garage would be more prominent in the streetscene and detrimental to its character. Notwithstanding the current shed to the front of the property, currently the property sits in a spacious plot with a

sense of openness to the front garden. The proposed single storey side extension would already extend the built form. The proposed garage would also introduce a built form which has the effect of extending the built form across the plot. This would appear out of character with the area and would reduce the sense of openness within the front garden. The cumulative effect of the proposals would dominate the street scene and cause harm.

9. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2016) (Local Plan) and Policy P7 of the St Mary Bourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2018) and the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018). Together these seek amongst other matters to ensure development is of high quality design which positively contributes to the street scene and responds positively to the context.
10. The property lies on the eastern boundary of St Mary Bourne and Stoke Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is divided into 5 areas that characterise its unique qualities and this includes 3 settlements that contribute to its special character. The property is located within the settlement of St Mary Bourne with the special appearance of this area being attributed to the gently curving linear development of buildings along the level river valley floor and the many buildings of architectural or historic interest.
11. The appeal property lies outside the historic core and is not referenced within the St Mary Bourne and Stoke Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as of any special significance. Whilst outside the historic core, the residential area is of 20th Century date and part of a planned development and therefore has a distinct character area within the conservation area. I find therefore the proposed garage which would appear incongruous in the streetscene would fail to respect and conserve the local character of the Conservation Area. Therefore, I find the proposed garage would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset. There are no public benefits demonstrated which would outweigh such harm. As such it would be in conflict with the Local Plan Policy EM11.
12. It is noted that trees within a Conservation Area benefit from protection. The Council have cited the potential impact on trees as being one of the reasons for refusal. However, the appellants have recently been granted permission for the felling of two trees, one of which would have been in potential conflict with the proposed garage. I observed on my site visit this tree has now been felled, and there are no other trees that would be impacted on by the proposed development. I therefore find no conflict with Policy EM1 of the Local Plan in respect of impact on trees.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge the proposed garage would provide space to work from home, which is supported within the Neighbourhood Plan. Similarly, I have considered other matters raised with regards to parking, other garages and outbuildings and the recent construction of the pumping station to the east of the property. However this does not alter my conclusions on this scheme and the harm that I find.

Conditions

14. I have considered the suggested conditions in light of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practise Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the Conservation Area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the replacement detached garage and allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and loft conversion.

Stephen Thomas

INSPECTOR