



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2024

by Michael J Muston BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/23/3334390

1 Chantreyland, New Road, Eversley, Hampshire RG27 0PA

- 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 Miss S Wickings and Mr S Motley against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01978/HOU, dated 1 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey hipped roof rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey hipped roof rear extension, at 1 Chantreyland, New Road, Eversley, Hampshire RG27 0PA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01978/HOU, dated 1 September 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P-3A, P-21-01 Rev D and 18.5344/M003.

Preliminary matter

2. In the addresses given in the heading and decision above I have used the postcodes given on the Council's decision notices and the appeal forms, which are different from those given on the application forms.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Chantreyland, with particular regard to the enjoyment of their remaining garden area.

Reasons

4. A previous application for a two storey hipped roof rear extension (22/02143/HOU) was refused in 2022 and dismissed at appeal in June 2023, on grounds relating both to the quality of the remaining amenity space and the

impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 2. This application for a single storey extension was refused solely on the grounds that the proposal would unacceptably detract from the quality and enjoyment of the garden area that would remain once the extension was complete.

5. I saw on my site visit that the garden to No 1 that would remain would continue to have an open outlook to the south and west. It currently houses a good sized patio area, an area of artificial grass and a small shed. This would be sufficient to provide for the needs of the residents of No 1. In this current proposal, the impact of the proposed extension, being only single storey, would not make the remaining garden feel unduly hemmed in or lacking in openness.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 Chantreyland, and would comply with Policies GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 Saved Policies which seeks to protect the amenity of residential uses, and Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032, which seeks high quality design sensitive to its surroundings.

Other matters

7. A number of local residents objected to the proposal at application stage. In addition to the issues I have considered above, these included objections on the grounds of impact on living conditions of neighbouring residents, impact on parking, and overdevelopment. I note that the highway authority raises no highway objections. I have considered whether any unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers might arise and have concluded that it would not. The Council came to the same conclusion in its delegated report. None of the matters raised outweigh my conclusion that the proposal is acceptable.

Conditions

8. As well as standard conditions relating to when the development should commence and compliance with the approved plans, a condition requiring the external materials used to match the existing building is necessary, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Michael J Muston

INSPECTOR