



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2021

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/21/3282203
101 Manor Park Drive, Yateley GU46 6JH

- 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 Dariusz Panasiuk against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00878/HOU, dated 24 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a three-storey side extension with a flat roof with solar panels and solar thermal system mounted on the flat roof and a single-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the interests of brevity and clarity I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice, which is agreed on the appeal form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Manor Park Drive forms part of an established residential area, suburban in form. Dwellings are predominantly semi-detached, two-storey and with pitched roofs, but there are also examples of single-storey properties and some short terraces in the area. Although not entirely uniform, the properties share a common understated typology (many appearing to be built at a similar time to the appeal property) and are set along well-defined building lines.
5. I saw that there are very few examples of extensions to the front of properties, although extensions to the rear are more common. The semi-detached property adjacent to the appeal dwelling, has a nearly full width and height, rear dormer.
6. The proposed development would extend significantly to the front and rear of the appeal property. When viewed from the north along Manor Park Drive, the rear element would be largely screened by the attached property's rear dormer, but the front element would be clearly visible. From Henley Gardens to the east, specifically the dwellings and their gardens adjacent to the site and the turning head, the proposed development could be seen although it would

be partially screened by the trees along the common boundary (one of which is protected by tree preservation order).

7. From certain southerly vantage points along Manor Park Drive, the proposed development would be largely visible, creating a predominantly blank and rectilinear three-storey high wall with no design features to break up its mass. This would result in a development seemingly out of scale with its surroundings, and at odds with the distinctive qualities of the area. The flat roof and full height of the proposed development, when viewed from the front, would unbalance the form of the semi-detached pair. This would create a dominant feature by going beyond the established built line of the road and would be incongruous to the uniformity of the area's appearance.
8. I appreciate that the property is not within a conservation area, would be set back from the road, and there is some screening from trees (as considered above). Nevertheless, those points are insufficient to negate, or to moderate to an acceptable degree, the harm that would result to character and appearance.
9. Therefore, notwithstanding certain moderating factors, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the local area. It would therefore conflict with the Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032, saved Policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan - Replacement 1996-2006, which both seek to achieve high quality design. The proposed development would also conflict with the approach in paragraph 130. c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (published July 2021, which in that specific respect is aligned with the previous iteration referred to in the Council's decision notice).

Other Matters

10. The appellant has put forward that they were not given an opportunity to amend the scheme through the application process. However, no information relating to potential scheme alterations were submitted, and not all schemes may be capable of being rendered acceptable.

Conclusion

11. The appeal scheme does not comply with the development plan as a whole nor the approach in the National Planning Policy Framework and there are no other material considerations that would indicate a contrary decision. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR