



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2008

by **Richard J Maile** BSc FRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:**  
7 January 2009

## Appeal ref: APP/M1710/A/08/2085222

### Harfields, Wield Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5NJ.

- 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 & Mrs Scott against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
- The application (ref: 22705/003/FUL), dated 14 January 2008, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2008.
- The development proposed is entire building facelift, including replacement roof and upper floor extension. New entrance porch and single storey side extensions.

## Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for entire building facelift, including replacement roof and upper floor extension. New entrance porch and single storey side extensions at Harfields, Wield Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5NJ, in accordance with the terms of the application (ref: 22705/003/FUL) dated 14 January 2008, and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) Details and samples of the materials to be used in the external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced on site. The development shall be carried out using such approved materials.

## Main Issue

2. From my inspection of the appeal site and surrounding area and consideration of the representations, I am of the opinion that the principal issue in this case is the likely impact of the proposed extensions and alterations upon the scale and character of the existing property.

## Reasons

3. Policy H16 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan Second Review allows for the extension of dwellings outside of settlement boundaries, but subject to restrictions as to any percentage increase above that of the original dwelling. The policy is designed to retain houses within the district to meet a continuing

need for smaller, less expensive accommodation. National guidance in PPS 3 also emphasises the need for a mix of dwelling sizes.

4. The Council suggests that, with extensions permitted in the past, the current proposal (some 38.3m<sup>2</sup>) would represent an increase of 141 per cent over the size of the dwelling as it existed in 1974. This figure is well in excess of the policy allowance of 50 per cent. There are, however, compelling reasons in this case to make an exception to policy.
5. The dwelling would continue to fall within the Council's category set out in Policy H16 of houses with a floor area of between 67 to 266m<sup>2</sup>. It would remain as a four bedroom property, but with all of the bedrooms at first floor level. Certain of the additional accommodation would be in the form of a waiting room, ambulatory toilet facilities for patients and a small entrance porch that would not increase the residential living accommodation. It is also important to note that a previous permission to extend the dwelling has not been implemented and that the existing conservatory would be demolished.
6. Of considerable influence in my decision to allow this appeal are the benefits, acknowledged by the Council, of a greatly enhanced appearance to the house brought about by elevational changes to create a cohesive and attractive overall design. There will also be benefits in terms of increased thermal efficiency.
7. Mrs Scott is a qualified physiotherapist. She treats a number of patients who live nearby and her continued business use of part of the premises will reduce the need for her to travel to work and for her local patients to travel further afield for treatments.
8. I have noted the appeal decisions quoted by both parties to this appeal. However, I have determined this proposal upon the particular merits of the case. Taken as a whole, these represent compelling reasons for allowing the scheme before me, which will bring with it an enhanced appearance to the dwelling.

*R. J. Maile*

INSPECTOR