

## Appeals Progress Report

### 1. Appeal Decisions

1.1 Appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission 17/00067/FULP for the erection of a detached garage block providing garaging for four cars with summer room and ancillary loft storage and games room at **Friars Keep, 41 Manor Road, Aldershot.**

1.1.1 The appeal was determined under the written representations procedure. The decision is dated 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

1.1.2 The Council's reasons for refusal cited the mass and bulk of the proposed outbuilding close to the boundary with 39 Manor Road, as giving rise to an oppressive and unneighbourly impact on the adjoining property and unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers due to loss of light, sunlight and overshadowing, contrary to Policy H15 of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review (1996 - 2011).

The development was further considered, by way of its scale and cumulative impact, to fail to enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area contrary to Policy ENV 34 of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review (1996 - 2011).

1.1.3 The Inspector found that the outbuilding would significantly reduce the spaciousness off the plot, as it was not subservient, and would compete in dominance with the existing house. It was therefore agreed that the development would fail to enhance or preserve the conservation area.

1.1.4 The Inspector did not find that the proposed outbuilding would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring property or garden given the existing mature boundary hedge.

1.1.5 The Inspector noted neighbours' concerns regarding the possible use for commercial purposes although this did not form part of the planning application. He did not consider that there would be any significant harm in this respect.

Decision – Appeal **DISMISSED**

1.2 Appeal against the refusal of consent to fell a sweet chestnut tree subject to a TPO (16/00957/TPOPP) At **9 Leopold Avenue, Farnborough.**

1.2.1 Consent was granted for crown reduction of the tree, its removal was refused.

1.2.2 The appeal was dealt with by means of the written procedure. The decision was issued dated 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2017.

1.2.3 The Inspector concluded that the tree forms part of a group which provides a backdrop to houses in the street adding significantly to the area's character. Its removal would materially harm amenity and its felling is not justified.

1.2.4 He did not accept the argument that its shading effect on the garden made the area unusable for reasonable garden amenity purposes.

Decision – Appeal **DISMISSED**

## **2. Recommendation**

2.1 It is recommended that the report be **NOTED**.

**Keith Holland**  
**Head of Planning**