

Appeals Progress Report

1. New Appeals

- 1.1 **Garage Block, Cold Harbour Lane, Farnborough** : Appeal against refusal of planning permission for : “Demolition of 14 garages and erection of 2 light industrial units (Use Class E(g)(iii)) with parking” under delegated powers - 23/00763/FULPP. This appeal is to be considered under the Written Representations procedure.
- 1.2 **Blandford House And Malta Barracks Development Site Shoe Lane, Aldershot** : Appeal against non-determination of planning application for “PART APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS: for the erection of 71 dwellings (Phases 4, 5 and 6), including access from Shoe Lane and Forge Lane, internal access roads, public open space, parking, lighting and associated infrastructure, following demolition of existing buildings and hardstanding, pursuant to Condition 3 (1-24) of Hybrid Outline Planning Permission 17/00914/OUTPP dated 15th May 2020. (AMENDED PLANS - INCLUDING HIGHWAYS TECHNICAL NOTE & ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AUGUST 2023) - 22/00340/REMP. This appeal is to be considered by means of a Hearing.

2. Decided Appeal

- 2.1 Appeal against refusal of planning permission for “Erection of a two storey side extension at **94 Field Way, Aldershot**; 23/00047/FULPP. This appeal was considered under the Householder Appeals Service.
- 2.2 Planning permission was refused under delegated powers in June 2023 for the following reasons:-

1 *The proposal, given its extent to the boundary and the reasonable likelihood of the two- storey side extension being built under permission Ref: 22/00401/FUL dated 28th July 2022 at property 96 Field Way, that this development would result in a harmful terracing effect on the street scene and would harm its character. As a result, it would not constitute good design, would not make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment and would fail to include high quality design respecting the character and appearance of the local area contrary to Policy DE1 (Design in the Built Environment) of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) and the Council's adopted supplementary Planning Document 'Home Improvements and Extensions (February 2020).*

2 *The proposal, as a result of the poorly contrived roof form, would result in an unsympathetic addition to the host building and would give rise to material and unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and it would not constitute good design or make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment contrary to Policy DE1 (Design in the Built Environment) of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) and the Council's adopted*

supplementary Planning Document 'Home Improvements and Extensions (February 2020).

- 2.3 The Inspector identified the main determining issue for the appeal to be effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. In this respect the Inspector noted that the appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on a street made up of predominantly semi-detached properties. Between pairs, there is typically a reasonable visual gap at first floor level which contributes positively to the character of the street. These gaps, together with the set back of dwellings from the road, give the street a spacious character.
- 2.4 The Inspector noted that there are various examples of two-storey side extensions in the area, however in each case there remains a visual gap to the next semi-detached pair at first floor level. Some pairs are set further back from the road than their neighbour, creating a staggered layout. The appeal site and its attached pair have both already been extended and are set further back from the road than No 96.
- 2.5 The Inspector commented that the proposed extension would have a hipped roof that would meet the existing gable end below the ridge, creating a small residual gable. While this would allow it to appear subservient to the main dwelling, it would result in an awkward interaction between the roof of the proposal and existing dwelling. Consequently, the Inspector considered that it would relate poorly to the existing dwelling, and fail to respect its appearance.
- 2.6 The Inspector noted that other hipped roofs on properties in the area are generally seen on ground floor extensions, so the extension roof is seen separately to the main roof. 118 Field Way features a two-storey side extension with hipped roof, however the ridge of the extension is in line with that of the host property. Consequently, these other examples do not result in the contrived roof form proposed in this appeal.
- 2.7 The Inspector noted that the proposed side extension would project to the boundary with No 96, significantly reducing the existing gap between these two pairs at first floor level and that, in itself, this would not be out of character with the area, where other extensions have narrowed the gap to the same extent.
- 2.8 The Inspector considered that it was relevant that No 96 had been granted permission for a two-storey side extension extending up to the boundary with the appeal site. Although this was not in place at the time of their site visit, the time period for implementation had not expired. In the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, the Inspector noted that there was the potential that this development would go ahead, and the appellant had not put forward any mechanism by which this could be prevented. While both schemes individually would not result in a harmful reduction in the gap between properties, if both were implemented, the Inspector considered that this would leave little or no gap between the pairs, resulting in a clear terracing effect that would be harmful to the character of the street scene.

- 2.9 The Inspector commented that the extensions would be slightly staggered at first floor, but project forward a similar depth at ground floor level. This would leave little articulation between the two pairs, such that the staggered layout would not significantly reduce the terracing effect.
- 2.10 Overall, the Inspector considered that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DE1 of the Rushmoor Local Plan 2014-2032 (adopted February 2019), which requires development to respect the character and appearance of the local area. It would likewise go against the aims of the Rushmoor Local Plan Home Improvements and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted February 2020), which outlines how extensions should relate well to the original building and not harm the character of the street scene, by not resulting in a terracing effect where visual gaps contribute to the character of the area.
- 2.11 The Inspector noted that the appellant had suggested that the proposed hipped roof could be changed to a gable roof by planning condition, if that were to be found acceptable. The Inspector commented that there was no such plan before them and, therefore they could not be certain that such a change would be less harmful than the proposal in terms of the roof form or the harmful terracing effect that they have identified. Furthermore, in the interests of fairness they must consider the appeal on the basis of what has been submitted, which was subject to public consultation and which the Council made its decision on.
- 2.12 The Inspector noted claims made by the Appellant that the proposed extension was required for health reasons but considered that no substantive evidence had been submitted to demonstrate this or to show that any required accommodation could not be provided through a more appropriate proposal. The Inspector gave this matter limited weight, and considered that it did not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the resulting conflict with local policy.
- 2.13 On this basis the Inspector agreed with the Council's reason for refusal and **Dismissed** the appeal.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 It is recommended that the report be **NOTED**.

Tim Mills
Executive Head of Property and Growth