



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2021 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/20/3263369

32 Reading Road, Chineham 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 Wayne Grice against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02077/HSE, dated 2 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is 'first floor extension to create additional living accommodation, involving raising of the roof, hip to gable roof alterations on the front elevation and installation of rooflight on side roof slope'
-

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 Matters

3. The description of development in the banner header above has been taken from the Council's decision notice. It is considerably shorter than that provided in the application form, which related to the initial scheme that was submitted and which was altered during the application process. While the appellant has provided a revised description in the appeal form, I consider that the Council's description more accurately reflects the proposed development.
4. Both parties refer to an appeal decision relating to the dwelling at No 34 Reading Road (No 34)¹. I have obtained a copy of that appeal decision from the Council and I have sent a copy to the appellant.
5. During the course of the planning application the scheme was amended. The Council determined the application on the basis of these drawings, and I have assessed the proposal accordingly.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

¹ APP/H1705/D/19/3240351.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site comprises a modestly sized detached property of one and half storeys. The proposal would add significant bulk and scale to the host property resulting in an overly large, top heavy addition that would be out of proportion with, and would dominate, the simple form and design of the property. In addition, the proposed first floor window to the front elevation would be larger than the windows at ground floor and would fail to align with them. It would appear as an over scaled and conspicuous feature that would draw the eye to the unacceptable scale of the proposal. The appellant indicates that he would be willing to consider adapting the size, scale and placement of this window. However, I have assessed the proposal before me.
8. The appeal property is located in a group of properties of similar scale with similarly low eaves. Although Reading Road is more widely varied in terms of the design, scale and form of dwellings, I consider that the proposal would be viewed within the context of this group. Within this context the extended property would appear as an incongruous and discordant feature within the streetscene and would fail to relate well visually to the neighbouring properties with its front and east elevations, due to their form and eaves height, appearing particularly discordant.
9. I observed the dwellings at Nos 12A, 14A, and 30 Reading Road referred to by the appellant, as well as those at Wallins Copse and Glade Close. However, these examples are of a different scale and form to the appeal dwelling. Further, while the dwellings at No 30 and Wallins Copse and Glade Close are close to the appeal site, they are not part of the group of dwellings that I consider form the context for the appeal property. Moreover, while other properties in Reading Road have a gable design with a barn hip, this does not justify the unacceptable proposal and I afford these matters limited weight.
10. The appellant refers to a commercial planning permission being granted to No 1 Reading Road, although no details of that development have been submitted. Moreover, given its location, that site is seen in a different context to the appeal dwelling. No details of a development to erect five maisonette flats have been provided and I am therefore unable to assess whether this scheme is comparable to that before me. Accordingly, I afford these matters limited weight.
11. I have had regard to the appeal decision relating to No 34 and I observed that works have been carried out to that property. However, I do not consider that they are directly comparable in scale, form or design to the proposal before me. Consequently, I afford this matter limited weight in my assessment of this appeal and do not consider that it provides justification for the proposal.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area, in conflict with the aims of Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011 to 2029) Adopted May 2016, which requires development, amongst other things, to positively contribute to local distinctiveness, the sense of place and the existing street scene and have due regard to the scale and appearance of the surrounding area. There would also be conflict with the Basingstoke and Deane Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document July 2018, which states that the scale of extensions should be subservient to, and be well-

proportioned in relation to, the existing building; and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure high quality design.

Other Matters

13. While the Parish Council commented on the initial scheme and a letter of objection was received, there is no evidence before me that any comments or objections were sent in respect of the proposal before me now. Further, the Council has not objected on the grounds of the proposal causing harm to the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties or parking. However, these matters are neutral factors in my assessment of the appeal and the harm that I have identified would be present notwithstanding them.
14. The appellant indicates that the proposal would provide more usable space for his family and this would improve his family's living conditions. This is a principally private benefit which does not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Moreover, it is likely that there are other solutions available which would provide the accommodation the appellant desires.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. 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