



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/20/3264300

The Gables, Oakhill Road, Headley Down, Bordon GU35 8EW

- 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 H Badenhop against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 27849/010 dated 27 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of extension to existing garage to create additional bay following demolition of existing shed. To include ancillary accommodation above, accessed via an external staircase.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's second reason for refusal related to the potential impact of the proposal on the health and stability of the protected oak tree in the neighbouring property. The Appellants advised that the tree is no longer present and this was confirmed at my site visit. Accordingly, I shall not consider further the Council's second reason for refusal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modern detached dwelling on the south side of Oakhill Road, leading off Furze Vale Road, within an attractive and leafy predominantly residential area. The house has a detached double garage under a hipped roof, to the front of the property set back from the road edge, with generous spacing both to the host property as well as to the front boundary edge. The garages to the two adjoining dwellings, constructed at a similar time to the appeal property, have a very similar siting in relation to the host property and front boundary as well as in terms of their scale and design.
5. The proposal seeks to extend the garage towards the road frontage to add another bay with accommodation over under a barn hipped roof. There would

- be six Cabrio rooflights on the front elevation and an external staircase on the side closest to the house leading to the first floor accommodation.
6. Garages sited forwards of the main property, whether attached to the house or detached are a common feature along Oakhill Road and Furze Vale Road. However, in terms of their size and height and their set back from the road frontage they generally appear as ancillary structures which do not over dominate either the host dwelling or the street scene.
 7. I agree that the location of the dwelling within an Area of Special Housing Character under Policy H9 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review does not prevent further development but sets out criteria for such development to maintain and respect the character of such areas.
 8. In this proposal the addition of a further bay would result in a considerably longer building. Although the eaves height would be lower than existing and the increase in ridge height modest, the change from a full hipped to a barn hipped roof would result in a much more imposing building in terms of its bulk and massing. As a result of these increases in scale and massing, it would no longer read as an ancillary structure in relation to the existing house, but as a much more dominant and over prominent building which would detract from the character and appearance of the existing house.
 9. Although there would remain a modest open set back to the road frontage, the extended garage would come much closer to the road edge. I consider that the reduced open gap to the frontage together with the increased bulk and massing of the extended garage would result in an overly dominant building in terms of the street scene. It would appear out of scale and unduly prominent in relation to the general pattern of development of smaller ancillary garages and so would harm the character and appearance of the local area.
 10. I therefore conclude that the proposed garage extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area. This would conflict with Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014), Policies HE2 and H9 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review, the Council's adopted 'Residential Extensions and Householder Development' Supplementary Planning Document as well as Government advice contained within Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR