



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/D/25/3371798

Beeches, Hussell Lane, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire GU34 5PD

- 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 Ben and Lucy Barrass against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application reference is EHDC-24-0082-HSE.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey rear extension and garage conversion at Beeches, Hussell Lane, Alton, Hampshire GU34 5PD, in accordance with the terms of the application reference EHDC-24-0082-HSE and the plans submitted with it, 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 nos 001p2 – location plan, 002p4 – existing site plan, 003p5 – proposed site plan, 011p4 – existing floor plans, 031p5 – existing elevations sheet 1, 032p3 – existing elevations sheet 2, 101p8 – proposed floor plans, 301p8 – proposed elevations sheet 1, and 302p4 – proposed elevations sheet 2.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs has been made by Mr & Mrs Ben and Lucy Barrass against East Hampshire District Council and this is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: -
 - The effect of the proposed rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
 - The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Beeches is a detached bungalow, with a multi-hipped roof and walls faced in brick. It takes a largely conventional form. The bungalow and its 2 detached garages screen the rear garden from public view from Hussell Lane. The rear garden is long and features mature landscaping. It is also enclosed on all sides. It is within this private space that the extension element of the appeal proposal would be sited. It is proposed to extend from the rear elevation of the dwelling, the latter being of no architectural merit and has been the subject of alterations in the past, including the addition of a modern conservatory.
5. The proposal would be subserviently sited to the rear of the host dwelling. This would leave the more sensitive, public views of the frontage from Hussell Lane unaffected. The design of the proposal would also leave the roofscape of the original dwelling largely intact.
6. The proposed use of timber cladding references the treed context and, although a contrast to the host dwelling's facing brickwork, would not be an incongruous external finish. The proposed glazing responds to best practice of maximising natural light permeating internal spaces and moderates the visual massing of the proposal. Together with the more contemporary form, these features would add interest and visual appeal to the rear elevation. Given its modest scale, the prevailing impression of the host property would also remain one of a conventional domestic form set within a spacious garden.
7. The relevant development plan policies do not require a proposal to match the form and materials of the original building, but rather that it takes account of and respects the existing design, scale and character.
8. Overall, I find no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. I therefore find accordance with policy CP29 of the East Hampshire District Joint Core Strategy (2014) and policy HE2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan (2006). Amongst other matters, these policies seek a high standard of design and external appearance.

Living conditions

9. The side boundaries of the rear garden at the appeal site are marked by close boarded fences, of circa 1.5 to 2 metres in height, and planting. This results in very limited intervisibility between the garden and neighbouring gardens. It is likely that the upper areas of the walls and roof edge of the proposed extension would be visible above the boundary fences when standing in the neighbouring gardens. However, given that so little would be visible, I find that there would be no harm to living conditions in terms of the effect on outlook.
10. The Council also raises concerns that there could be a loss of privacy if a window within the proposed garage conversion, facing the neighbouring dwelling of Stratton Croft, was not obscure glazed. The intervening boundary is marked by a dense hedge, screening views and ensuring no loss of privacy. As a result, living conditions of the occupiers of Stratton Croft would not be harmed, even if clear glazing was used for this window.

11. I therefore find accordance with policy CP27 of the East Hampshire District Joint Core Strategy 2014, insofar as they relate to the effect on the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. The Council also suggested that a condition is imposed to ensure 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. However, that would conflict with the proposed timber cladding as annotated on the submitted plans, which I have found to be acceptable. Hence, I have not imposed this condition.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal takes into account and respects the design, character and appearance of the host dwelling. I also conclude that there will be no harm to living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, specifically in relation to outlook and privacy. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

S Sharp

INSPECTOR