

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/25/3368523

19 Hamble Drive, Tadley, Hampshire RG26 3UN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Capel against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Reference is 24/02585/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor rear and side extension and new front boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and b) living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey gable-ended home on a good sized broadly rectangular plot. It lies within an undulating 1980's housing area of generally detached homes with gardens and open or treed areas which, taken together, form an area of established residential character and a pleasing suburban scene with a sense of spaciousness. The appeal proposal is as described above.
 4. A characteristic of the area is that, for the most part, two storey elements do not abut side boundaries; this is one of the features that adds to the qualities of the scene providing meaningful gaps between properties particularly at upper levels. Where possible it is my view that this set-back from fence lines should continue, on both sides of a shared boundary. Unfortunately, the appeal scheme's two storey vertical walling would effectively sit on the boundary and, to my eye, appear cramped and not in character with the local development context. Added to this is the fact that the overall bulk and design of the planned addition which would appear ungainly, lacking in subtlety, and not display any meaningful sense of subservience to the main building.
-

Therefore, and notwithstanding that this home is on relatively low ground, the appeal scheme taken as a whole would read as discordant to the host property and the immediate and wider locality.

5. Policies EM1 and EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (LP) are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they seek development which would be well-designed, of suitable scale and architecture for the context, reflect local distinctiveness, and protect the character of an area. I conclude that the scheme would run contrary to these policies. It would also conflict with the parallel objectives of the Council's Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018) (SPD), albeit this guidance cannot be expected to cover every detailed eventuality.

Living conditions

6. 17 Hamble Drive is a detached two storey home which lies to the north of the appeal property, on higher ground, and with its rear elevation angled slightly towards No 19's rear garden. It has a small conservatory at the nearest rear point to the pertinent shared side/rear boundary.
7. Regrettably, the planned two storey element would, given scale and proximity, create an uncomfortable sense of over-bearing for these neighbours. I consider that the structure, even given relative levels, would create a feeling of being hemmed-in and remove a marked degree of wider outlook. Furthermore, whilst I appreciate the technical findings of the submitted Daylight and Sunlight report there would be some, albeit modest, change to daylight and sunlight penetration and this adds to my concerns in terms of living conditions.
8. Previously cited LP Policy EM10 also seeks to protect residential amenity. I conclude that there would be a breach of this policy in this regard as well as the neighbourliness aims within the SPD.

Other matters

9. I was extremely sorry to learn of the severe medical situation within this household and do hope that the Appellant and Council can work together to reach a solution satisfactory to all.
10. I am cognisant of the issues of foundations and ground floor supporting walls and while I understand the ethos of 'forever homes' it does appear that the Appellant may not have taken full *planning* advice when constructing at ground floor level. It is most unfortunate that this situation has been reached.
11. I recognise that neighbours and the Town Council have not objected but I have to consider the amenity available to dwellings for the longer term and secure well-designed development.
12. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issues identified above.

Overall conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR