



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2024

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/24/3347961

Oakleigh, 1A Church Road, Tadley, Hampshire, RG26 3AU

- 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 and Mrs Paul Holmes against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00915/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new porch and two-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a new porch and two-storey rear extension at Oakleigh, 1A Church Road, Tadley, Hampshire, RG26 3AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00915/HSE, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers:
 - Drawing No: 01a, 'Existing plans & elevations' (April 2024)
 - Drawing No: 02a, 'Proposed plans & elevations' (April 2024)
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The bathroom window at first floor level on the southern elevation of the dwelling shall be glazed with obscured glass to at least the equivalent of Pilkington level 4 standard. The window and glazing shall be installed prior to occupation of the development and shall be permanently maintained in that condition.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional openings shall be inserted at first floor in the southern elevation of the extension without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 1B Church Road in respect of outlook from the rear outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

3. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be approximately 6 m deep, 8.5 m wide and 7.3 m high. It would subsume an existing single storey extension, extending the footprint to the rear by about 3 m. The flank wall would be approximately 1.8 m from the boundary with No. 1B.
4. The flank wall would cover a short distance when compared to the overall length of the garden of No. 1B. In addition, it would be coincident with the rear patio of No. 1B, rather than the wider garden. I conclude that the reduction in outlook from the garden of No. 1B would be minor.
5. The boundary between the properties is marked by a high fence and occasional trees. From the garden of No. 1B, this boundary is viewed against a backdrop of nearby tall, mature trees. These existing factors would further lessen the impact from the development.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would not result in an unreasonable sense of enclosure, nor would it be overbearing. It would therefore not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 1B. The proposal does not conflict with Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 or the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018), which state that development must provide a high quality of amenity for occupants of neighbouring properties.

Other matters

7. I understand that the appellants have submitted a separate planning application for an alternative configuration. For the avoidance of doubt, I have made my decision on the plans associated with application 24/00915/HSE and have not considered any amended drawings.
8. The appeal site is adjacent to the Tadley Church Road Conservation Area and opposite the entrance to Hawley Farmhouse and granary, which are Grade II listed. No party has raised concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on these heritage assets. Having considered the proposal, which would be on the opposite side of the property, and visited the site, I concur with that view. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and that there would be no effect on the listed buildings or their settings.

Conditions

9. The Council recommended six conditions. I have imposed most of these, with slight amendments to the wording in the interests of precision and clarity, and to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. In addition to the standard timescale, a condition to secure accordance with the approved plans is required in the interests of enforceability. I have also imposed Condition 3 to ensure that the appearance of the building is preserved.
11. Conditions 4 and 5 are necessary to protect the privacy of the occupants of No. 1B Church Road.
12. The Council also recommended a condition to prevent occupation of the extension until provision for turning of vehicles and parking for three vehicles

had been made, and to ensure that this space is not used for anything else in the future. However, the Officer's Report states that sufficient parking and turning space is already provided and this is consistent with my observations at the site visit. No specific concerns regarding highway safety have been raised and I do not consider it necessary to ensure that the space is secured for this purpose in perpetuity.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above the appeal should be allowed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR