



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/21/3283860

Wayside, Day Lane, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO8 0SH

- 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 Mrs Jo Selway against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21122/03, dated 25 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to front, single storey extension to rear, new dormer windows to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to front, single storey extension to rear, new dormer windows to front and rear at Wayside, Day Lane, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO8 0SH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21122/03 dated 25 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accord with those shown on drawing No. Selway_01A Revision B
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; Block plan; and drawing No. Selway_01A Revision B

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development as it appears on the decision notice as this more accurately describes the appeal proposal.
3. The Council's Delegated Report states that whilst the proposal includes new dormers on the rear elevation, as well as a single storey rear extension, these works could be built under permitted development. As a consequence, the Council do not raise any objection to these elements of the appeal proposal or to the proposed dormer windows on the front elevation. I concur with the Council's findings in this respect and have proceeded to determine the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the southern side of Day Lane and forms part of a small development of six properties (including the appeal site). The host property comprises a large detached chalet style bungalow. It is set well back from the lane with its frontage laid to lawn and car parking. The adjoining properties, to the west and east, also comprise large detached bungalows and chalet style bungalows that are set back from the lane and vary in terms of their age, style and form.
6. Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) (JCS) requires the design of new development to respect the character, identity and context of its surroundings. Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (2006) (LPSR) states that alterations and extensions will be permitted where they take account of the design, scale and character of the original building, its plot size and setting.
7. The above policies must be read in conjunction with the East Hampshire District Council: Residential Extensions & Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD). Paragraphs 2.21 – 2.25 (inclusive) of the SPD state that front extensions will normally only be acceptable where: the development is set back from the road; the streetscene includes a staggered building line; the development occupies a countryside location where the character of the area is low density, properties are set back from the road or well screened. The SPD continues by stating that front extensions should also be subservient, should not project significantly beyond the main front wall or be visually prominent.
8. Within the above context, the host property and its four immediate neighbours, are set well back from the lane. The front boundaries to all five properties are formed from a mixture of banking, hedging and mature trees. Whilst there are gaps within this screening, particularly for individual driveways, as I observed on my site visit the screening to the appeal site is effective in limiting views of the host property particularly when approaching from the west.
9. Moreover, there is a staggered building line, with the front of the host property sitting well behind the front of Hillside to the west and also, but to a lesser extent, behind the front of Hillcroft and White Gate to the east. As there are also only five properties fronting the lane (with a further dwelling to the rear of the appeal site known as Woodside), all within relatively large plots, the character of this rural area is low density.
10. The proposed front extension itself does not project significantly beyond the front wall of the host property, and its hipped roof design, overall ridge height and pallet of materials, including the use of cladding on the first floor, would result in an extension that would, on balance, appear subservient to the host property. Combined with the other works proposed to the host property and having regard to the large plot size, the set back from the lane, existing landscaping and the varied built form, the new two storey front extension would not, in my judgement, be visually prominent within the streetscene.

11. Whilst I accept that there would be a material change in the appearance of the host property, the proposed front extension would not be unsympathetic to the proportions and character of the host when viewed in the context of the proposals to remodel and modernise its appearance. The proposed extension would also not result in a discordant feature within the streetscene given that the latter exhibits no uniform character, comprises only five properties within a rural location, where, as well as there being no established building line, the existing buildings comprise a mixture of brickwork, render and roof materials.
12. For the above reasons, I am satisfied that the proposed front extension would accord with the guidance set out within the SPD. As with all such guidance, it should be applied flexibly and not rigidly, and have regard to the individual circumstances of the case including its local context, which is the approach I have adopted in determining this appeal. The proposed front extension would sit comfortably on the appeal site and combined with the hosts remodelled appearance the appeal proposal would not be out of keeping with its surroundings. The varied built rhythm of the streetscene would not be harmed, and as a consequence of the above the appeal proposal would not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
13. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would not conflict with policy CP29 of the JCS, policy HE2 of the LPSR, the relevant guidance within the SPD or paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (Framework).

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested various conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions.
15. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is necessary and reasonable in order to secure a high-quality development and to reflect the details included with the application.
16. However, I am not convinced that a condition requiring prior approval, before construction commences above slab level, of the proposed materials is either reasonable or necessary. The proposed materials are referenced on the submitted plan and in section 10 of the Application Form. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I am satisfied that the proposed pallet of materials is acceptable given the local context and I have, therefore, modified the wording of this condition accordingly.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR