



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

**by Helen Davies MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 February 2022**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/21/3281448 14 Kimber Close, Chineham RG24 8XZ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Maslen against Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00814/HSE, is dated 4 March 2021.
  - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a 2 storey side extension is refused.

### **Preliminary Matters**

2. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the Council's failure to determine the planning application within the statutory timescale. However, the Council has provided an appeal statement which sets out the reasons why planning permission would have been refused, had the jurisdiction to determine the application remained with the Council. I have had regard to the Council's appeal statement in setting out the main issues.

### **Main Issues**

3. The main issues are:
  - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
  - The effect of the proposed parking arrangements on highway safety in Kimber Close.

### **Reasons**

#### *Character and appearance*

4. Kimber Close is a residential street in a predominantly residential area. It is made up of modern dwellings, either detached or linked by garages. The dwellings are two storey and of a modest size with modest gardens. Kimber Close features consistency in terms of materials and scale. Most of the dwellings front onto the highway but are set back by variable amounts as the frontages do not closely follow the shallow 'S' shape of the highway. 10, 12 and 14 Kimber Close front onto a private drive which is at an angle to the highway. Despite this variety in layout, the frontages along Kimber Close form a series of fairly clear and consistent building lines. The majority of dwellings have a drive

or parking area to the front. There is an area of open space, with grass and a few trees, adjacent to the highway in the southern half of Kimber Close.

5. The appeal site at No 14 is of a similar scale and design to the surrounding dwellings, with an attached garage and parking to the front. The garden is slightly larger than neighbouring gardens but is still relatively modest. The appeal site is on the junction of the private drive and the highway, so it is the side elevation which faces the highway rather than the front elevation. However, this side elevation is consistent with the building line formed by the frontages of the 3 dwellings to the south of the appeal site.
6. The proposal would add a large, two storey extension to the side of the host dwelling. Whilst the roof ridge would be set down, and the front elevation set back, the width would be similar to the existing two storey section of the host dwelling. Consequently, the size of the proposed extension would be overly dominant and out of proportion with the host dwelling. The extension would also feature a staggered frontage and stepped roof ridge. Taken together, these factors would result in an extended dwelling that was unbalanced and visually jarring.
7. Due to its position, on the junction of the private drive, and on a bend in the road, No 14 is a prominent feature of Kimber Close. The extension would be highly visible from the front, the side and the rear. The extended dwelling would be significantly larger than the rest of the dwellings on Kimber Close and there is no evidence of any other large two storey extension in the immediate area. The proposed development would take the side elevation of the host dwelling to a position close to the highway. This would disrupt the consistency of the building line which the host dwelling currently shares with the dwellings to the south. The extension would also disrupt views towards the open space from the north of Kimber Close. Consequently, the scale and layout of the extension would not reflect the established character and distinctiveness of the area and would not relate well to neighbouring dwellings. This would be exacerbated by the high level of visibility within the streetscene.
8. I conclude that the proposed 2 storey side extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the development would not comply with Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011 to 2029 (LP), which amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development is well designed and contributes positively to local character and distinctiveness.

#### *Highway safety*

9. I have not been provided with a copy of the Parking Supplementary Planning Document 2018, or Policy CN9 (Transport) of the LP, but the Council state that the proposal would result in the appeal site having a shortfall of 1 parking space. I acknowledge that a shortfall could potentially lead to additional parking on the highway, and the site is located on a bend. Notwithstanding this, the bend is modest and Kimber Close is a relatively quiet cul-de-sac. As a result, the parking of one additional vehicle on the highway would be unlikely to result in highway safety issues. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified to character and appearance.

### **Other Matters**

10. The appellant has stated that planning officers did not act in a positive and proactive manner during the course of the application. The Council dispute this. I note the appellant's frustration but have dealt with the appeal on the basis of its planning merits.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Helen Davies*

INSPECTOR