



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14TH January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/24/3351381

Silverlea, Paice Lane, Medstead, Alton GU34 5PT

- 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 T W Marlow against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 33657/001.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing garage; 2 storey extension to each side of the existing property and erection of a double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Paice Lane.

Reasons

3. In respect of the main issue, the Officer's Report explains that in deciding to refuse permission for the appeal application, the Council has had regard to Policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy 2014 under which development proposals are required to be sympathetic to their setting in terms of scale, height and massing, and to their relationship to adjoining buildings and spaces around buildings.
4. Policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review 2006 has very similar objectives, whilst the Council's Residential Extensions & Householder Development SPD 2018 precludes side extensions that would result in an unacceptable loss of space between buildings and requires such additions to be subservient to the original building. The SPD also cautions that front extensions in a countryside location should be subservient to the original building and should meet established building lines.
5. I saw on my visit that Silverlea is a modestly sized mid/late C20th chalet bungalow of essentially formulaic design with little or no design merit. As such it would appear in principle to have at least some potential for alterations and additions that would combine an increase in living space with an improvement in its appearance, and thereby make a more positive contribution the street scene of Paice Lane.

6. However, I also observed that at the front, the distance from the projecting bay to the roadside boundary is somewhat limited and that with a fairly open eastern flank boundary, the dwelling is read with the side and front elevations of Dry Hill Cottage.
7. Given these circumstances, I consider that the construction of the large front facing gable-end, with its increase in height from the existing building (itself to be raised) and read with the proposed double garage extending well forward of the building line, would be an unduly bulky and dominant cumulative addition to the property. And as the Council's report says, this would be contrary to the SPD's requirement for front extensions in a countryside location to be subservient to the original dwelling and meet established building lines. The OS Block Plan submitted as part of the application with the proposed development shown in red clearly shows the significant extent to which the appeal scheme would fail to meet this requirement.
8. The grounds of appeal refer to other properties in Paice Lane with large footprints and double garages close to their front boundaries. However, whilst acknowledging that there are such properties, I do not consider that these characteristics are sufficiently in occurrence to be typical of the street scene. And perhaps more to the point, I have had regard to the particular circumstances of this case including the relatively open aspect of Silverlea and how the proposal would visually relate to the immediately adjoining dwellings, especially Dry Hill Cottage to the east.
9. I have taken account of all other matters raised, but overall I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Paice Lane. This would be in conflict with the aforementioned Policies CP29, HE2; the Council's SPD and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024.
10. The appeal therefore fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR