
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/19/3240351

34 Reading Road, Chineham, Basingstoke RG24 8LN

- 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 Riad Yassine against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01544/HSE, dated 7 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear extension, raising of the roof height of the original dwelling and conversion of loft and alterations to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey rear extension, raising of the roof height of the original dwelling and conversion of loft and alterations to roof at 34 Reading Road, Chineham, Basingstoke RG24 8LN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01544/HSE, dated 7 June 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings: Ordnance Survey Location Plan licence no. 100053143 titled "Site/Location Plan as Existing" and "Site/Location Plan As Proposed"; Ordnance Survey Location Plan licence no. 100053143 titled "Block Plan...Scale 1:500 Existing" and "Block Plan...Scale 1:500 Proposed"; drawing titled "Existing...East Facing Elevations, Existing...West Facing Elevations, Proposed...East Facing Elevations and Proposed...West Facing Elevations", drawing titled "Existing...Rear Elevations, Existing...Front Elevations, Proposed...Rear Elevations and Proposed...Front Elevations"; drawing titled "Ground Floor Plan...Existing"; drawing titled "Ground Floor Plan...Proposed"; and drawing titled "Proposed...First Floor Loft Conversion".
 - 3) Space to the front of the dwelling shall be kept available at all times for the parking of three motor vehicles by the occupants of the dwelling and their visitors and for no other purpose.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow, finished in facing brick under a tiled hipped roof, with a gable-ended front projection. The site is set back from the road behind a grassed highway verge, and the dwelling is sited behind a hard-surfaced frontage parking area, and is visible in the street scene behind the frontage wall and fence. The site sits within a group of six similarly modest-sized hipped roof bungalows, with low eaves heights at the front, and most of which include subsidiary front projecting elements. Within these bungalows, there are variations in roof form and materials.
4. Beyond the bungalows, to both sides, are chalet bungalows and two-storey dwellings of differing designs and materials. There is a two-storey residential development focussed around Glade Close on the opposite side of the road. As such, the street scene around the appeal site is very varied in character. The road is busy and dwellings on both sides, within the vicinity of the appeal site, are set well back from the highway edge.
5. The proposal would replace the main hipped roof with a barn-hipped roof, with an increase in ridge height of 1 metre above that of the existing. The subsidiary front projection would be widened and altered to include a barn hip with an increased ridge height of 0.5 metre. The proposed front gable to the main building would introduce a different form of roof within the cluster of six bungalows and this would be visually apparent when viewed from the street.
6. However, notwithstanding the position of the appeal property near the centre of the group of bungalows, I do not find the proposal to be unduly harmful in respect of its impact on the existing bungalow and on the wider townscape. It would retain low eaves heights and a strong sloping roof form to both sides of the dwelling. The front projecting element would remain subservient in scale to the main building, and would have a similar barn hip roof form. It would not appear discordant in views from the street, given the variety of front projection designs associated with the neighbouring bungalows.
7. The use of matching bricks for the front gable wall would aid the visual assimilation of the proposal with the remainder of the ground floor, comprising a wall finish which is characteristic of the site vicinity. The proposed smooth grey roof tiles for the whole of the roof would be in keeping with those of the neighbouring property at No.36, where more contemporary roof alterations have taken place.
8. The proposed increase in the main ridge height would not appear incongruous within the street scene, given the existing variations in the ridge heights within the collection of bungalows. The proposed front elevation first floor window would not be an alien feature, given the existence of a front dormer on one of the other bungalows within the cluster. The barn-hipped front elevation design is evident elsewhere within this stretch of Reading Road, beyond the group of bungalows within which the site is located.
9. The set-back position of the property from the road frontage, together with the presence of larger properties and mature landscaping further along the road in both directions beyond the row of bungalows, means that the appeal property is not readily apparent in longer views when approaching from both sides. Accordingly, I find that, although the proposal would notably alter the appearance of the front of the bungalow, given the aforementioned variety of

dwelling types and designs within the locality, and the set-back position of the property, the proposal would not appear unduly visually intrusive within the townscape of this part of Reading Road. Neither would it demonstrably harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, since it would incorporate design detailing, roof forms and materials which are evident within the site locality.

10. In making this judgement, I have had regard to the extant planning permission Ref 18/00970/HSE, for roof extensions, which include raising the main ridge height by 1 metre and the inclusion of a large front dormer window within a hipped front roof slope. During my site inspection, I observed that work had commenced in respect of this approval. Accordingly, I attach significant weight to it.
11. In light of the above, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan (2011 – 2029) 2016 (BDBLP) and the Council's adopted Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (DSSPD), which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that extensions are of a high quality and positively contribute to local distinctiveness, the sense of place, and the existing street scene. For similar reasons, the proposal would also accord with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) which seeks to ensure high quality design.

Conditions

12. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. Where necessary, I have modified or deleted them. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary to define the plans in the interests of certainty, and to ensure that the external materials of the development are appropriate, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. In the case of the latter, since the external materials are detailed on the application drawings, there is no requirement for a separate planning condition to deal with this matter. In the interests of highway safety, a condition is required to ensure the provision of adequate on-site car parking, in accordance with Policy EM10 of the BDBLP and the Council's adopted parking guidelines.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR