



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc

**Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07 November 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/19/3232629**

**69 Long Grove, Baughurst RG26 5NU**

- 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 Stacey against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 19/00324/HSE, dated 31 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2019.
  - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear and two storey side and rear extension and new front porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Procedural Matter

3. The appellants have requested that I consider the original plans that were submitted with the planning application. The plans before me are drawing numbers AB-01 Rev A and AB-02 Rev A. There is no indication whether or not these are the original plans the appellants refer to, but as they are the only plans before me I have assessed the proposal on the basis of the information contained within them.

### Main Issue

4. It is clear from the Council's decision that it has no objection to the single storey rear extension or the porch. I have no evidence before me to reach a contrary view to the Council in this regard.
5. The main issue is therefore the effect of the two storey extension on the living conditions of the occupants of No 67 Long Grove, with particular reference to outlook.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached house attached to No 71. The dwelling is set back from the front elevation of No 67, such that it extends several metres beyond the rear elevation of No 67.

7. The proposed two storey extension would be constructed in close proximity to the party boundary with No 67. As a result of the layout of the respective dwellings, the extension would result in a long, tall, imposing feature in close proximity to the rear windows and garden of No 67. The mass of the resultant extension and tall brick wall would result in a prominent, dominant feature in the outlook from the rear of No 67. It would have a significant enclosing effect making the rear garden closest to the house and rear rooms facing towards the rear garden less pleasant to use. The living conditions of the occupiers of No 67 would be adversely affected as a result of the new two storey extension.
8. The appellants have drawn my attention to the rear extensions at Nos 71 and 73 Long Grove. Although I was able to observe these extensions on my site visit, I was not able to assess the impact of them on the occupiers of each property. In any event both properties have extensions, thus the circumstances are not directly comparable to the proposal before me and its relationship to No 67. Each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits and the presence of similar development nearby does not justify harmful development.
9. Whilst there has been a lack of objections from interested parties regarding the proposal, including the occupants of No 67 and the Parish Council, this is a neutral factor, which does not weigh in favour of the proposal. It is recognised that the extension has been designed with the 'wrap-around' element to secure an adequate size for the proposed bedroom, and that the proposal would improve the living conditions of the appellants, however this does not outweigh the harm identified.
10. In light of the above, I find that the two storey extension proposed would have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 67 Long Grove, with particular reference to outlook, in conflict with Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011 to 2029) (adopted May 2016), which requires development, amongst other matters to respect the amenities of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, Policy EM10 specifically references the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018) (SPD), and the proposal would conflict with the advice given in the SPD in relation to the need for extensions to be designed having regard to the impact on neighbouring properties.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alex O'Doherty*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*RC Kirby*

INSPECTOR