

Appeals Progress Report

1. New Appeals

1.1 There are no new appeals to report.

2. Appeal Decisions

2.1 Appeal Against the refusal of planning permission for: Erection of 4 one-bedroom flats with parking on land at rear at **40 - 42 Park Road, Farnborough**, (17/00153/FULPP).

Planning permission was refused under delegated powers for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposal, by reason of the extremely restricted width of the access way, which is considered to be insufficient to serve the number of dwellings proposed, and the poorly located and insufficiently dimensioned passing space, is likely to result in conflicting vehicle movements on the highway and within the site, to the detriment of vehicle and pedestrian safety. The poorly laid out parking area may lead to the parking of vehicles in the incorrect spaces, resulting in the full complement of spaces being unavailable. Moreover, the narrow width of the driveway may discourage residents and visitors to the site from using the parking spaces provided, which would lead to additional on-street parking, to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is thereby considered to be contrary to Policy CP16 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy.
- 2 The proposed block of flats would have an adverse impact upon the outlook, amenity and privacy of the occupiers of the residential dwelling to the north by reason of its proximity to the boundary and the inclusion of balconies, contrary to Policy CP2 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy and saved Policy ENV17 of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review.
- 3 The proposal, by reason of the lack of open space around the building and the proportions of the building, fails to include high quality design that respects the character of the area and is thereby contrary to Policy CP2 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy and saved Policy ENV17 of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review.
- 4 The proposal would not provide adequate and usable private amenity space for the proposed flats while also significantly reducing the amenity space of the existing flats, which adversely affect residential amenity, contrary to saved Policy H14 of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review.

- 5 The proposal fails to make satisfactory provision for the storage and collection of refuse and recycling bins which is likely to result to result in an adverse impact on the amenity of the existing and proposed residents and an obstruction of the parking area, the vehicular access to the site and the adjacent highway, contrary to Policy CP16 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy and saved Policy ENV17 of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review.
 - 6 The proposal fails to provide mitigation for the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in accordance with the Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Interim Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and is therefore contrary to Policy CP13 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The Inspector agreed with the Council that the that the proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the area and would conflict with Policy CP2 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy 2011 (CS) and Policy ENV17 of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review 2000 (LP) insofar as development is required to include high quality design and that the scale, layout and spaces around buildings are consistent with the character and appearance of the area. He agreed that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 54 Park Road with particular regard to privacy and outlook and that the proposal would not therefore comply with CS Policy CP2 or LP Policy ENV17. He agreed that the proposal would not provide adequate external space to safeguard the living conditions of future occupiers and would conflict with LP Policy H14 by failing to make adequate provision for the storage and removal of refuse and recycling bins. Finally, the Inspector agreed that in the absence of suitable mitigation measures, the proposal was likely to have a significant impact upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, contrary to CS Policy CP13. The Inspector did not support the Council in its concerns about the narrow width of the proposed vehicular entrance and the impact upon highway safety, or the proposed parking layout.

3 Recommendation

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

Keith Holland
Head of Planning