



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/22/3308763

101 Manor Park Drive, Yateley, Hampshire, 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 22/01030/HOU, dated 10 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single-storey front and rear and two-storey side extensions with accommodation in the roof space and solar panels on the roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling, which is situated in a residential area. Dwellings along Manor Park Drive vary in terms of house types, ages and sizes. I also noted at my site visit that there is staggered layout to some of the blocks of buildings along Manor Park Drive, but in general terms there is a consistent building line with few front extensions.
4. The proposal is to enlarge the appeal property by constructing single storey front and rear extensions and a two/three-storey extension at the side and partially in front of the existing front wall of the property. A large part of the side extension would also have a flat roof, on which solar panels would be erected. The front and side extensions would be clearly visible in the streetscene, particularly when approaching the property from the southerly direction.
5. A previous application for a similar extension was refused by the Council on 29 June 2021 (21/00878/HOU). That proposal was also dismissed at appeal on 20 December 2021 (APP/N1730/D/21/3282203). The appellant has sought to address the previous concerns by making amendments to the design of the extensions.
6. The Development Plan for the area comprises the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 (LPSS), The Hart Local Plan – Replacement 1996-2006 (LPR) and The Yateley, Darby Green and Frogmore Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2032 (NP).

Policy NBE9 of the LPSS seeks to ensure that the design of all development is of high quality. Saved Policy GEN1 of the LPR requires (amongst other things) for developments to be in keeping with local character. In addition, Policy YDFNP4 of the NP requires development to respond positively to local character and respect surrounding buildings in terms of scale, height, form and massing.

7. The Council contends that the proposal conflicts with the above policies, as it would be an incongruous and dominant feature in the streetscene. I agree with that assessment. Although there have been some design changes since the earlier proposal, I consider that the bulk and mass of the proposed side extension, particularly when viewed from the southern direction would result in an overly dominant addition, which would be out of scale with the existing dwelling and its surroundings. This would be exacerbated by the extension projecting in front of the existing front wall of the property. In addition, the expanse of flat roof would be an alien feature that would be harmful and at odds with the character of the dwelling and out of place in the streetscene.
8. In reaching my decision, I note that the extended dwelling would be some 8m from the highway boundary. The appellant has also pointed out that no objections were raised by neighbours. Notwithstanding, I consider that the proposal is unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene and it conflicts with the provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR