

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2024

**by A Price BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 23 August 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/24/3339970**

**Robin Cottage, Reading Road, Mattingley, Hook, Hampshire RG27 8JZ**

- 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 Mr Young and Ms Carter against the decision of Hart District Council.
  - The application Ref is 23/01775/FUL.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension to a previously converted agricultural barn. Change of use to include agricultural land within residential curtilage.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a parcel of land which accommodates a residential dwelling, understood to have once formed an agricultural building, together with an area of hardstanding and a garden. The main part of the site is accessed via a long private drive. The appeal site is, in part, visible from the wider area, including from Reading Road. It is also visible from a number of private vantage points. From those vantage points, the existing buildings appear as reasonably modest agricultural buildings. The site undisputedly falls within the open countryside.
4. The proposed development would extend the existing building considerably, introducing a new wing, which would be at odds with the layout of the existing building. Moreover, the extension would be two storeys high and feature a prominent gable end with dormer projections.
5. Although I accept that the appellant has worked to amend and reduce the overall scale of the extension, and that materials would match the existing building, it would nevertheless still appear as a dominant, incongruous and clearly domestic addition to the relatively modest building. This would have an

urbanising effect on the site which would harm its rural character and that of this part of Mattingley.

6. That there are other properties in the area, some of which that have been extended over time, is not reason to automatically accept development at the appeal site where harm has been identified. Moreover, even were I to find the proposed residential curtilage extension acceptable, it would not overcome or outweigh the harm identified above in respect of the extension.
7. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would fail to accord with the relevant provisions of Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) Saved Policies and Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (2020). These policies, in summary, seek to ensure high quality design in development that respects the existing buildings and their context, including local landscape character.
8. Policy NBE1 has been referenced within the decision notice. However, the proposal would meet an exception under this policy, at point (g) as it would provide an extension to an existing dwelling. The proposed development would accord with this policy.

### **Other Matters**

9. I have some sympathy for the appellant, who seeks to extend their home. However, this is a private benefit which does not overcome or outweigh the harm identified.
10. I also acknowledge that there would be no harm to the living conditions of any nearby occupiers as a result of the proposed scheme and that no objections were received. However, the effect on living conditions is not in dispute between the Council and appellant. That there were no objections is neutral in the determination of the appeal. In the same vein, that pre-application advice was given is not determinative in the appeal. Overall, these matters do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

*A Price*

INSPECTOR