



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/25/3364060

Stavanger House, Lord Wandsworth College, Long Sutton, Hook RG29 1SN

- 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 Carding against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02358/HOU.
 - The development proposed is extension to the existing garage & annexe building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to the existing garage & annexe building at Stavanger House, Lord Wandsworth College, Long Sutton, Hook RG29 1SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 24/02358/HOU subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BA 0266 10 C; BA 0266 13 B; BA 0266 14A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental or ancillary to the residential use of the host dwelling, presently known as Stavanger House.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and
 - Whether the proposal, in terms of its size, appearance and amount of accommodation would be tantamount to the creation of a new dwelling in the countryside.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a large detached two storey dwelling in generous grounds, on the south side of Hyde Lane where it crosses with Hyde Road within the grounds of Lord Wandsworth College, and in an open rural location. There is an existing detached garage and annexe building (annexe) on the western side with garaging and storage on the ground floor and accommodation above as well as a three-bay car port to the north of the annexe.
4. The proposal would seek to provide a single storey link to join with the existing single storey element at the side of the main dwelling. It would increase the size of the existing annexe both by extending primarily to the rear but also extending and altering at the front and increasing the height of the building under a crown roof. The submitted plans show that the ground floor would accommodate store and utility uses together with a bedroom and bathroom with living and home office uses at first floor.
5. Although the works would add to the floorspace, scale and massing of the existing annexe, the size and scale of the proposal requires to be considered in the context of the proportions and massing of the existing dwelling. In relation to the main house, the proposed extension would remain subordinate in scale and massing. The subordinate form of the extension would be assisted by its siting to the rear of the frontage of the main dwelling and the ridge height of the extended roof would remain lower than the existing dwelling.
6. In wider views of the appeal site, the main dwelling is primarily seen, with the existing annexe and car port being partly hidden from view. I consider that this would continue with the extension in place, and that in wider views, that part of the extension which would be seen, would appear secondary to the main dwelling. As a result of the proposed extension, I do not consider that the extended annexe building or the overall built form on the site would become more visually intrusive in the countryside.
7. The reason for refusal includes reference to the design of the proposed link to the main dwelling which the Council considers would be weak, being long and narrow and as a result the Council has stated that it considers that the proposed extension would not appear incorporated into the main dwelling. I take a very different view and consider that the low level link would assist in breaking down the scale and massing of the overall composition and being single storey to connect with the single storey element of the existing dwelling, it would be appropriate in scale and form and would serve its purpose as a linking element.
8. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extension would respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. There would be no conflict with Policies NBE1 and NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 (Local Plan 2032), Policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006 (Local Plan 1996-2006) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high standard of design which respects the local context.

Whether tantamount to a new dwelling

9. Policy NBE1 of the Local Plan 2032 sets out where development proposals will be supported in the countryside and this includes at g) an extension to an existing dwelling. This is the basis that the proposal has been submitted. Whilst I acknowledge that the extension would contribute a sizeable addition in floorspace terms, I have already concluded that it would, in scale, proportions and design, respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. The Council is concerned that because of the size of the extension that the proposal would be capable of functioning independently and would be tantamount to a stand alone dwelling.
11. However, the proposal is for an extension to the existing annexe to the main dwelling and that is what is before me. Taking into account the considerations raised by the Council in its report on the application regarding annexes, I have already found that the proposal would remain subordinate to the main dwelling in terms of design and scale. The annexe would be linked to the main dwelling and would not therefore be detached. The existing annexe is and the proposed would remain within the curtilage of the main dwelling, be in the same ownership and with a common access with the main dwelling. Indeed, access to the annexe is and would remain past the front of the host dwelling. The plans show no boundary demarcation or subdivision of the garden areas between the curtilage of the main dwelling and the annexe. There would be ample parking for the site.
12. I acknowledge that subsequent alterations could be made to the dwelling and there is no specific information regarding the proposed functional connection. Whilst I understand the concerns of the Council there is no information before me to suggest that the proposal would be to create a new dwelling. Taking account of all the considerations relating to annexes, I am satisfied that the proposal in terms of its size, appearance and amount of accommodation would be acceptable as an extension to the existing annexe and therefore to the existing house. A condition could and should be imposed to provide the Council with future control were the circumstances to change.
13. On the basis of its submitted proposal as an extension to the existing annexe, I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not compete with the main dwelling in terms of accommodation and would not be tantamount to the creation of a new dwelling in the countryside. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies NBE1 and NBE9 of the Local Plan 2032, Policy GEN1 of the Local Plan 1996-2006 and the Framework in terms of development within the countryside.

Other considerations

14. The Appellants have drawn my attention to a permission granted by the Council close by to the appeal site under the Ref: 21/01954 which they consider has similarities to their proposal, as well as to a number of appeal decisions relating to annexes, under the Refs: APP/Y9507/D/16/3150815, APP/B0230/D/24/3341255 and APP/N1730/D/24/3350791. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits and that has been the basis of my consideration in this case.

Conditions

15. The external materials should match the host property in order to respect the character and appearance of the existing building and of the local area. I shall list the approved plans in the interests of good planning and for the avoidance of doubt. I shall also impose a condition to require the proposal to be occupied for purposes incidental or ancillary to the main dwelling to accord with the terms of the application and to reflect the countryside location of the site.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matter raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR