



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/20/3255589

7 Broome Close, Yateley, Hampshire GU46 7SY

- 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 Anthony Barton against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02756/HOU, dated 2 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extensions following demolition of single storey side and rear extensions and single storey side and rear wrap around conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of two storey side and rear extensions following demolition of single storey side and rear extensions and single storey side and rear wrap around conservatory at 7 Broome Close, Yateley, Hampshire GU46 7SY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02756/HOU, dated 2 December 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved plans: Ordnance Survey Location Plan licence no.100038864 Refs 1284349 and 1284350 and drawing dated April 2019 titled "proposed rear and side extension following demolition of single storey side and rear extension plus rear and side wrap round conservatory".
 - 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 Matters

2. On 30 April 2020, since the refusal of the planning application, the Council adopted *the Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2032* (HLPSS). The Council has confirmed that Saved Policy GEN1 of the *Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006* (HDLP) has been saved and continues to form part of the development plan, and that Saved Policies GEN4 and URB16 of the HDLP have been superseded by HLPSS Policy NBE9. This Policy is consistent with the approach of the replaced HDLP policies. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal having regard to the saved and recently adopted Local Plan policies.

3. I have amended the description of development slightly from that on the application form to match that of the decision notice and appeal form, which more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a large, detached, dwelling dating back to the late twentieth century, with facing brick walls under a hipped, tiled roof. It is located within a small, quiet, suburban cul-de-sac of similarly designed houses which are set in generous plots.
6. The houses which directly front onto the road are visually prominent in the street scene due to the low front boundary walls which typify the road. Whilst some have been altered and extended, there remains a strong degree of uniformity across the close in respect of the scale, materials and symmetrical, Georgian style frontages of the properties.
7. The size and design of the appeal property are consistent with the established dwelling form within the close. The design of the property has not been significantly altered by the existing single storey flat roofed side addition. The proposed side extension, due to its size, would add a notable amount of volume to the existing building. However, I do not find that this would harm the character and appearance of the building and the wider area.
8. Whilst comprising a large addition, the 2 storey extension would appear distinct from, and subservient to, the host property. This is due to its hipped roof form, which is smaller in scale to that of the main roof, and would provide a visual break at roof level from the main dwelling. The subordinate appearance would be reinforced by the narrower width of the extension in comparison to the host property, and its noticeably set back position behind the front wall of the building.
9. The side extension would fit comfortably on the site without resulting in an excessive proportion of the site curtilage comprising built development, due to the existing large garden, particularly to the side adjacent to the proposal. As a result the enlarged house would not appear cramped on the site, thereby retaining its spacious character in keeping with the surrounding development.
10. Furthermore, the location of the dwelling, sited off one of the cul-de-sac heads, means that it does not directly face the street. It is not visually prominent when viewed from the public realm, and makes little contribution to the visual amenities of the street scene. As such, the proposed 2 storey extension would be largely screened in views from the street by the main dwelling, due to its discreet set-back side position in relation to the host property. Also, it would be mainly obscured in views from Chandlers Lane by mature tree screening around the appeal site. Therefore, the side extension would not significantly impact on the visual amenities of the street scene, nor upset the established pattern of similarly designed dwellings fronting onto the cul-de-sac.

11. The Council has not raised any objection to the proposed single storey element of the appeal scheme and, on the basis of the evidence before me and my site inspection, neither do I.
12. In light of the above, I find that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would accord with HLPSS Policy NBE9 and HDLP Policy GEN1, which amongst other things, aim to ensure that development proposals achieve a high quality design and positively contribute to the overall appearance of the local area, and are in keeping with the local character by virtue of their scale, design, massing, height, prominence and materials. For similar reasons, the development accords with guidance in Chapter 12 of the Framework which requires high quality design.

Conditions

13. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the national Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary to define the plans in the interests of certainty and require the use of matching materials in the interests of appearance.

Conclusion

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

S Leonard

INSPECTOR