



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2023

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/23/3314739

19 Balsan Close, Basingstoke RG24 9SY

- 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 Nicola Shrimpton against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
- The application Ref 22/01631/RET, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2022.
- The development proposed is described as the 'erection of outbuilding (Retrospective)'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I saw at my site visit that the outbuilding has been erected on site in accordance with the plans before me, therefore I have considered the appeal on the basis that the development has already taken place.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Balsan Close is part of a wider suburban estate, with a consistent architectural form and pattern of development, including areas of landscaped open space which contribute positively to the softening of suburban form, improvement in biodiversity and a sense of space.
5. The timber outbuilding is located immediately next to detached garages in the front of the semi-detached appeal property, conspicuously and incongruously outside of the residential curtilage of the appeal property. Whilst sited next to the larger garage outbuilding, a timber outbuilding in this location is visually prominent from surrounding properties and a nearby footpath and appears stark and obtrusive in the street scene.
6. The Council set out that this area was formerly designated landscaped open space, and this is not disputed by the appellant. Its current use as a location for the outbuilding and for parking significantly detracts from open design of this part of the street scene and undermines its coherence. The addition of some limited planting around the outbuilding does not compensate for the loss of the open space.

7. The appellant provides photographs of outbuildings within the wider area. No addresses or further details are provided; however, I note that it is stated that none have the benefit of planning permission. As such, none are comparable to the development before me.
8. It is acknowledged that the planning application did not receive any objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties, indeed attracted some support. However, this is a neutral factor which does not alter my conclusions on the main issue. Whilst the appellant has set out that the development complies with other policies and various paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this to be expected in any development and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
9. Consequently, the development conflicts with Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011 – 2029 (2016) which, in accordance with the Framework, requires development to be visually attractive and positively contribute to the local distinctiveness, sense of place, and the appearance and use of streets and other public spaces. It also conflicts with the protection of street scene guidance in the Council's Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR