

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/22/3293690

18 Station Road, Petersfield, GU32 3ES

- 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 P Donovan against the decision of the South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/21/05081/HOUS, dated 6 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a detached outbuilding following demolition of existing outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a corner plot with an end of terrace home and detached garage/outbuilding in a relatively dense and historic part of town. It lies in the Petersfield Conservation Area. The proposal is as described above and would embody parking and storage with an office over.
 4. The scheme is set against the background of an extant planning permission (ref SDNP/20/03724/HOUS) which includes a new outbuilding. Along with the principal parties I agree this is realistic fall back. However, whilst the Appellant is of the opinion that due to revised heights, roof form and positioning the appeal scheme would be less of an imposition on the amenity of neighbours than the fall back the Council has taken the opposing view. The Council considered that the scheme would be oppressive and dominant to occupants of 20 Station Road given their limited rear amenity space and the height, scale, bulk and positioning of the planned building.
 5. I have carefully considered all the evidence and the arguments put by the Appellant that set out in detail a comparison of the fall back scheme and the current proposal. I note the specifics of the dimensions which are indicated along with the explanation of roof form as planned relative to the extant permission including the cat slide approach and eaves and ridge heights. However, both in its own right and as a comparison to the fall back, I am concerned that the appeal scheme would lead to a marked and unacceptable diminishment in the amenity enjoyed by occupants of 20 Station Road. The south east corner, and hence walls and roof slope, would simply be too close to
-

the ground floor glazing of the neighbouring dwelling and the run of new building along the common shared boundary be too extensive. Furthermore, the relationship is not helped by the angling of the boundary. Occupants of the neighbouring property would have undue impact upon their internal and external outlook and any sense of space, and they would feel uncomfortably hemmed-in. A scheme of this footprint and bulk with this positioning would simply be inappropriate over-development in amenity terms.

6. In all the circumstances I conclude that there would be unacceptable conflict with South Downs National Park Local Plan Policies SD31 and SD05. Taken together and amongst other matters these policies seek to protect residential amenity for residents nearby to any planned development.
7. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that all relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.
9. I would add that I agree with the Council that the scheme would not run contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR