



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/21/3271638

Crantock, South Road, Liphook, GU30 7HS

- 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 K Snuggs against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 58878, dated 24 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey front and side extension and single storey rear "open area" extension following demolition of existing garage and link building. Rendering of external walls at ground floor level and replacement of existing tile hanging and roof tiles. Replacement of windows with new powder coated aluminium windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the entrance gate and walls. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the extensions and planning permission is granted for two storey extensions to front and rear, single storey rear "open area" extension, replacement of windows with new powder coated aluminium windows, rendering of external walls at ground floor level and replacement of existing tile/hanging and roof tile at Crantock, South Road, Liphook, GU30 7HS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 58878, dated 24 August 2020, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Unless varied by other conditions of this decision, the development hereby permitted, insofar as it relates to the two storey extensions to front and rear, single storey rear "open area" extension, replacement of windows with new powder coated aluminium windows, rendering of external walls at ground floor level and replacement of existing tile/hanging and roof tile only, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; 200602/01, 200602/07 Rev A, 200602/08, 200602/09, 200602/10, 200602/12, 200602/13, 200602/14, 200602/15, 200602/16, 200602/17, Soil Management Statement – 200602.
 - 3) Notwithstanding any indication shown on the approved plans, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved the first floor windows in the north-

eastern elevation hereby permitted shall be permanently; (i) glazed with obscure glass with a glass panel which has been rendered obscure as part of its manufacturing process to Pilkington glass classification 5 (or equivalent of glass supplied by an alternative manufacturer), and (ii) non-opening below 1.7 metres from the finished floor level of the room in which the window is installed.

- 4) Notwithstanding any indication shown on the approved plans and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved the rooflight windows hereby permitted in the south/western elevations shall be constructed, with a sill height of not less than 1.7 metres above internal floor height, and shall subsequently be retained in that condition.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given above in my formal decision is taken from the Council's decision notice as the proposal was amended during the course of the application and this more accurately describes the final proposal.
3. For the reasons that follow, I find the proposed extensions to be acceptable and it is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed entrance gate. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and allow the appeal in respect of the proposed extensions while dismissing the proposed entrance gate and walls.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

5. South Road is an attractive residential area of large detached properties on large plots. The properties vary considerably in their individual design characteristics and form. The area is characterised by houses set back from the road with mature hedgerows, trees and grass verges delineating boundaries on one side of the road and long open front gardens laid to lawn on the other, creating a soft pleasant environment. Whilst properties to the north west of the road are open and readily visible when travelling along South Road, properties to the south east are set back behind mature landscaping. Properties along South Road vary in their design characteristics and ages, with both single and two storey dwellings and a range of materials.
6. Crantock is a detached dwelling well set back from the adjoining access road. Existing mature trees and hedgerows bound the frontage of the site meaning that the existing dwelling can only be glimpsed when passing the driveway. Its set back nature and levels of boundary treatment mean the dwelling is not readily visible in the wider street scene. The dwelling itself is two-storey with a single storey link to a double garage that projects forward of the front elevation.
7. The proposal involves the construction of an entrance gate and associated brick walls. The entrance gates would be clearly visible when travelling along South

Road and would introduce a prominent feature that would appear significantly at odds with the soft pleasant environment created by the green boundary treatments that currently run along this side of the road. The introduction of the gates would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.

8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed entrance gates and brick walls would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would be contrary to the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy 2014 (JCS) Policy CP29 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development contributes to local distinctiveness and sense of place. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks good design sympathetic to local character.
9. The proposed extensions would be fairly modern in design and introduces render to the dwelling. It would use design features such as small hipped-roof dormers and matching materials that echo the host dwelling to tie the existing and proposed development together. The proposal would be set down from the ridge of the host dwelling ensuring that the proposal would be viewed as an extension and allow the dwelling's existing form to be easily read.
10. Furthermore, the set down from the ridge ensures that the proposal appears subservient to the host dwelling. Whilst part of the proposal would project further forward of the front elevation than the existing attached garage and the depth of the extension would be reasonably substantial, its location to the side of the host dwelling, combined with its set down nature ensures that it would not overly dominate the host dwelling or create an unbalancing effect. Whilst the forward and rear projection of the proposal would create a large extension, due to the aforementioned design features it would appear as an extension and subservient to the host dwelling and the siting, scale and mass of the proposal would not consequently cause harm. Furthermore, the surrounding area is characterised by large, detached dwellings of varying ages and styles of design. The proposal would not alter this overall character and appearance.
11. For the reasons set out above I consider that the proposed extensions would not be overly dominant or harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Accordingly, I find no conflict with the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Reviews (2006) Policies H9 and HE2, the JCS Policy CP29, or the guidance contained within the Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development takes account of the design, scale and character of the original building, its plot size and setting. The proposal also complies with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks good design sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. Third parties have raised concerns with regards to the potential impact of the proposal on the living conditions of Lob's House. The proposal introduces windows at first floor on the side elevation looking towards Lob's House. I accept that the addition of these windows could increase overlooking. However, as they are set at a reasonably high level and would be secondary windows into a bedroom, where a further window/juliet balcony would be provided, I see no reason why these windows could not be obscure glazed. This would mitigate any overlooking and thus there would be no loss of privacy from the windows.

Such a condition has been requested by the Council in their submission and no objection to this has been raised by the appellant.

13. Concerns over highway safety are also raised. However, I note that a double garage would remain at the property with other space available for vehicles to park in front of the house, and manoeuvre within the site so as to enter and leave the site in forward gear.

Conditions

14. The Council has provided a list of conditions, which I have assessed in regard to the advice provided in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The Council have requested a condition relating to an annexe. However, no annexe is shown on the submitted drawings. Clarification sought during the appeal process confirmed that this referred to previous superseded plans and as such this condition is not considered necessary. The requested materials condition is not considered necessary as the materials are clearly outlined on the drawings. As above, a condition requiring the windows in the first floor of the north-east elevation to be obscure glazed is imposed. I have also imposed a condition concerning the proposed roof lights in the south west roof to be situated at over 1.7 metres. This is considered necessary in order to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents. I have altered the wording of some conditions in order to ensure they comply with the PPG.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the extensions, but dismissed insofar as it relates to the entrance gate and walls.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR