



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2024

by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/24/3340485

13 Cairngorm Close, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG22 5DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs S Knauf against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02917/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new front porch including roof terrace and installation of two new windows and two access doors to first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matter

2. The Appellant offers to reduce the width of the proposed roof terrace if required and to erect 1.8m privacy screening; but this appeal must be determined on the detailed design as submitted to and refused by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposed extension and roof terrace on the character and appearance of 13 Cairngorm Close and the neighbouring area and on the privacy of nearby properties within the Close.

Reasons

4. No 13 Cairngorm Close already has a ground floor front porch extension across the full width of the terraced dwelling. This is larger than any other front extension in the Close and, in my view, looks incongruous. Be that as it may, the existing extension has planning approval under a previous application.
5. However, I consider that adding a first-floor roof terrace over the present extension, with new access doors and waist-high, glazed parapets, would make the development even more prominent, such that it would become unacceptably out of keeping with the appearance and character of the existing house and the Close as a whole. Moreover, the use of the terrace by occupiers would further add to the change in character of the property.
6. Furthermore, those using the terrace would have an open view towards several other of the surrounding terraced properties, albeit limited to their frontages. I agree with the Council that potentially Nos 3 and 4, to the south, and Nos 7 and 8, opposite to the west, would be worst affected in this respect.

7. I accept that there would be no adverse impact on the rear of neighbouring properties and also that Cairngorm Close exhibits no special architectural merit demanding protection. However, I consider that the adverse planning impact with respect to character and appearance alone warrants dismissing the appeal, whilst the potential overlooking adds to the case against the proposal.
8. I note the submission of the Appellant that the terrace is being sought as a means of providing alternative private amenity space to the dwelling and that the existing rear amenity space is in almost constant shadow due to the presence of a large mature tree on public land directly to the south. From inspection, it does not seem to me that this effect is likely to be especially severe, although the preference for an open front terrace is understandable, In any event, this consideration is substantially outweighed by the strong planning objections I have identified.
9. For the reasons explained above, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies EM1 and EM10 of the adopted Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan and supporting guidance which, consistent with national policy, require development to respect local visual amenity and to contribute positively by good design to the appearance and use of streets and public spaces.
10. I am thus led to the conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR