



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2024

**by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13 December 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/24/3351115**

**The Coach House, Andover Road, Highclere RG20 9PF**

- 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 & Mrs B Thurston against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 23/02504/HSE.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension and associated alterations following demolition of existing detached garage. Proposed new vehicular access.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, no objections were raised by the Council to the proposed new vehicular access. From all the information before me as well as my site visit, I have no reason to take a different view.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2024. I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is an attractive, detached dwelling on the east side of the Andover Road (A343), together with a detached garage. It shares an access with the property to the north, The Old Rectory. The property is generally well screened from the road by dense hedging. There are a range of mainly detached houses on both sides of the road along this part of Highclere, within a verdant setting.
6. The proposal would extend the property at right angles on its eastern side, projecting forward of the existing house, following demolition of the existing garage and would incorporate a new double garage. The existing shared access would be stopped up with a new access off the Andover Road. The proposed extension would be longer than the existing house. The extension would

- include three dormers, compared with the two on the existing dwelling, and on the basis of the submitted plans, each of the new dormers would be slightly larger than the existing dormers.
7. Although no higher than the existing ridge line, the proposed extension would incorporate an area of flat roof which would run along the whole length of the proposed extension. I recognise that this would only be visible from certain points around the property and particularly at the rear, but this would still be a visually discordant element in relation to the character and appearance of the existing property.
  8. Although the existing detached garage is a double garage, the scale and proportions of its openings are broken down with the use of two single garage doors. The proposed design of the integral double garage would include a double door and the opening would be out of scale and proportions and as a result visually unsympathetic with the pattern of openings in the existing dwelling.
  9. The extension as proposed would dominate the scale and form of the existing dwelling. It would not be well proportioned in relation to the main dwelling but would be an overly dominant and discordant addition. Although primarily seen from the rear of the proposed extension, the proposed flat roof would be a jarring element in the overall composition and would further detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
  10. A high quality of design should be the objective of all those involved in the design process and I find that this scheme would fall short of the high standards that the Framework and the Council's development plan seek to promote. The proposal, taking into account its scale, proportions as well as its design, would not respect but would overwhelm and would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
  11. Although there can be no certainty that it would remain in the future, I have no reason to consider that the existing hedging around the boundaries would not be maintained and this would screen largely screen views into the site. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling from the proposal before me.
  12. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. This would conflict with Policy EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (May 2016), the Council's Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Guidance 2018 and the Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the character and appearance of existing buildings and the local context.
  13. The Council has also raised, in its Officer's report, albeit not specifically in the reason for refusal, that the proposal would weaken the historic relationship between the appeal property and the Old Rectory. Although the two properties appear to have once been related, they are now seen independent of each other and I do not consider that this concern would, on its own, justify withholding permission. However, it does not outweigh the harm I have already concluded.

14. The Appellants have drawn my attention to a number of other extensions which have been permitted in the local area. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits, but to the extent that the information has been provided to me on these other schemes, I have taken them into account. However, none of them appear to me to be directly comparable to the proposal before me and they do not therefore persuade me to a different view.

### **Conclusion**

15. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*L J Evans*

INSPECTOR