



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/21/3279655

Pinewood, Oakhanger, Bordon, Hampshire GU35 9JN

- 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 Paul Turner against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 25668/004, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described by the Council as single storey rear extensions and double garage with lounge infill between existing and re-built garage and rooms in roof space following demolition of the rear conservatory and detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice, which is agreed on the appeal form. It is more succinct and clear than that on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The Council's reason for refusal focuses specifically on the effect of the proposed development on the host dwelling. However, as the host dwelling forms part of a semi-detached pair and is within a small settlement, it cannot be considered in isolation from the broader character and appearance of the area. That lens is consistent with the perspective from which the appellant has made their case at appeal.
5. The host dwelling is within a row of properties of which there is some variance in age and design. Some are detached and some semi-detached, and they vary between one and two storeys in height. The host dwelling is a single storey, semi-detached property. Some of the properties have been extended so that their overall scale and similarity to their neighbours has altered. However, in most cases, where they are semi-detached, the alterations are broadly consistent between both dwellings. This creates a sense of harmony and general impression of symmetry between individual pairs.

6. Notwithstanding these differences within the appearance of the individual dwellings there is a consistency in the character of the area. The properties are all set-back from the road providing a broadly consistent building line. Architectural detailing tends towards the conventional both in terms of materials, proportions, and orientation. This creates a shared cadence in how the individual properties are read.
7. The proposed development would have a similar footprint, width, and location to the existing extension on Sherfield (the attached property). However, the proposal would continue the ridge height of the host dwelling along the full length of the extension and include 2 dormers. This would significantly increase its bulk in relation to the extension of Sherfield and unbalance the roof form of the semi-detached pair, as well as fail to accord with the specific guidance relating to ridge heights of side extensions, as set out in the Council's 'Residential Extensions & Householder Development' Supplementary Planning Document.
8. The proposed front elevation would constitute a garage door and blank wall, with one disproportionately small window, under a deep overhang. The front door would be positioned in the corner of the extension hard up against the side of the original dwelling. This harms the relationship of the host dwelling with the road, by removing the visual cues traditionally found in many front elevations of the properties within the immediate area.
9. The appellant considers the use of render, the overhang to the front and the dormer windows as design features which would offer variety and break up the scale and mass of the proposal. I accept that innovative design and traditional detailing are not inimical. However, in this instance these features do not reflect the design and character of the original building and its semi-detached neighbour, nor provide a high-quality external appearance reflecting the immediate area's particular characteristics – namely consistent design features and a reasonable level of balance between semi-detached pairs.
10. In conclusion, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire Local Plan: Second Review, and Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Council: Joint Core Strategy.

Other Matters

11. I note there was some public support for the proposed development and accept that the proposal would result in greater useable floorspace of the property. Nevertheless, for the foregoing reasons, those matters are insufficient to outweigh the clear harm that would result.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR