



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2021

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/21/3268367

Copperfield House, 111 South Lane, Clanfield, Waterlooville PO8 0RY

- 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 and Mrs T Hearn against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22358/017, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing garden store/garage including windows at first floor level to form an annexe of habitable accommodation (part alternative to 22358/016).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to existing garden store/garage including windows at first floor level to form an annexe of habitable accommodation (part alternative to 22358/016) at Copperfield House, 111 South Lane, Clanfield, Waterlooville PO8 0RY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22358/017, dated 28 October 2020, 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 following approved plans: Drawing numbers 18/33/11 Rev D; 18/33/10 Rev B; and 18/33/01.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order, with or without modification) the enlarged garden store/garage building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental to the residential use of 111 South Lane, Clanfield, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 0RY, from which it shall not at any time be let, sold separately or severed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the host property and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies on the corner of South Lane and Drift Road, at its junction with Red House Lane and Downhouse Road, within the settlement of Clanfield. It is occupied by a large, detached chalet-style dwelling with a steeply pitched roof form. It shares vehicular access from South Lane with No.109, which is a similarly designed detached dwelling. The existing garage comprises a detached, timber-framed building with a part gable and part hipped tiled roof. It is sited close to the frontage behind mature boundary hedging which encloses the front garden and obscures the garage in views from the street. Both neighbouring properties at 109 South Lane and 146 Drift Road have large detached garages positioned close to their frontages.
4. The appeal site has been subject to two previously allowed appeals¹ that granted permission to extend the existing garden store/garage. The current proposal would have the same footprint, eaves and ridge heights, steeply pitched roof form, first floor windows in the north and south side elevations and materials as the scheme approved under the most recent appeal.
5. The current proposal seeks to alter the east and west elevations from those of the approved scheme. On the east elevation, the previously approved gable ended projection would be replaced with a small flat-roofed ground floor projection and a small flat-roofed dormer. On the west elevation, facing the front of the site, the approved gable-ended projection would be replaced with a higher gable-ended projection, including glazing, with a similar footprint and projection from the building. These changes would not materially alter the approved overall design style of the extended building, which was found to be in keeping with that of the host property by the previous appeal Inspectors.
6. The dormer and flat roofed single storey projection would both be small-scale and subservient to the building as a whole, and would not visually compete with the pitched roof form of the main roof. The increased height of the approved front gabled projection, whilst adding more bulk to the building at roof level and incorporating a glazed element, would not detract from the overall character of the previously approved building, as supported by the previous appeal Inspectors. The proposed steeply pitched roof form, materials and glazing design would complement those of the extended building as a whole, and the limited width and degree of projection of the front addition would remain similar to those of the previously approved scheme. As such, this element of the proposal would add interest to the west elevation without appearing unduly dominant.
7. The proposal would reduce the massing of the previously approved outbuilding where it is closest to the host property, and the enlarged element of the building would be furthest from the dwelling, so that there would be no significant increase in building bulk in relation to the host property. The proposed west elevation feature gable would be reflective of the large gabled element on the front of the host property. Accordingly, the proposal would remain subservient in scale to, and complement the design of, the host property.
8. Sufficient space would remain between the extended building and the site frontage so that the building would not appear cramped on the site and the

¹ Appeal Refs: APP/M1710/D/19/3231738 and APP/M1710/D/20/3247161

position of the building would enable the retention of the existing mature front boundary hedging which provides screening of the building in views from the public realm. The extended building would not appear out of place within the context of nearby large garages of varying designs sited close to the road frontage.

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and that of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy CP29 of the *East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy 2014*, Saved Policy HE2 of the *East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (2006)* and the *Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2018)*. These policies and SPD, amongst other things, aim to ensure that new development respects the character, identity and context of the district's towns, villages and countryside, is appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, massing and relationship to adjoining buildings, and that outbuildings are subservient to the main dwelling.
10. For similar reasons, the proposal would also accord with Chapter 12 of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2019* which requires high quality design.

Other Matters

11. Having regard to neighbour concerns in respect of privacy, the south-facing first floor window has already been approved under the most recent previous permission, and would look towards the roof of the garage of no.146. Although there would be some oblique views toward the frontage of that neighbouring property, the degree of separation and orientation of outlook would not result in any significant overlooking that would result in a harmful loss of privacy to the occupiers of that property.
12. The rear dormer window would serve a bathroom and is proposed to be obscure-glazed. It would directly face the garden of the appeal site, and more obliquely the front garden of no.146, and the side/front elevation of the dwelling at that property. The combination of the design of the dormer window, the distance between the window and the property at no.146, and the orientation of the window in relation to that property and its front garden would mean that there would be no material harm to the privacy of the occupiers of that property.
13. I acknowledge the third party concerns regarding residential use of the store/garage building. Habitable use within the building has been established through the most recent appeal decision. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed habitable accommodation, and neither to I, subject to a condition preventing the proposed annexe accommodation from being used as an independent dwelling, as detailed below.

Conditions

14. 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.
15. Since the materials are indicated on drawing number 18/33/10 Rev B, I shall not include a condition suggested by the Council in respect of materials. I am

satisfied that the details shown on this drawing are sufficient to ensure appropriate materials for the structure, in the interests of the appearance of the area.

16. I concur with the views of the previous Inspectors, that the enlarged garden store/garage building would be located where a new dwelling would not normally be permitted. As such, and having regard to the intended use of the building as annexe accommodation, a condition is necessary to ensure that the outbuilding would only be utilised incidental to the residential use of the host dwellinghouse and that it would not be let, sold separately or severed from that host property.

Conclusion

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

S Leonard

INSPECTOR