

Appeals Progress Report

1. New Appeals

- 1.1 One new appeal has been received and 'started' by the Planning Inspectorate since the last Committee meeting.
- 1.2 **162 Fleet Road, Farnborough Hants:** Against an enforcement notice requiring removal of a 2 metre high timber fence with access front gate to front of property and covered carport. This will be considered together with the planning appeal against refusal of permission to retain the unauthorised development which was reported in July 2020 by way of the written method.

2. Appeal decision

2.1 91 Cranmore Lane, Aldershot

Appeal against refusal of planning permission for "Erection of single storey side extension and alterations to detached garage to form store" in July 2019 with planning application 19/00368/FULPP. Planning permission was refused under delegated powers for the following reasons:-

"Taking into consideration the existing design and architectural features of the building and that the building is a Building of Local Importance (BOLI) (a non-Statutory heritage asset) designated for its high evidential, historic and aesthetic values, the proposed extension is considered to be out of keeping and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing building in terms of its scale, proportion, horizontal form, fenestration, flat roof, lack of detailing and position on the existing building. The proposals would also result in the loss of existing architectural features and character of the original building. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would have an unacceptable detrimental impact upon the property contrary to Policies HE1 and DE1 of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) and the Council's adopted 'Buildings of Local Importance' SPD (2012)."

- 2.2 The appeal was considered under the Written Representations procedure. In determining the appeal, the Inspector considered that there was no objection to the proposed garage alterations (indeed the Council's reasons for refusal related entirely to the proposed side extension), if the garage conversion proposals needed planning permission they were acceptable and were severable from the consideration of the proposed extension. The sole determining issue was therefore considered to be the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to the non-designated heritage asset status of the house.

- 2.3 The Inspector described and noted the heritage significance of the appeal property as a locally listed building and that it is semi-detached to a house of similar design, form and use of materials that is also subject to the same BOLI status. As a pair they are aesthetically attractive due to their design and both have historical, architectural and evidential qualities. The appeal dwelling was noted to have a prominent gable roof and bay window to the side. However, the proposal would result in the removal of this side bay window and erection of a single-storey extension spanning most of the depth of the building. The Inspector considered that such an expanse of new building would dominate the side of the building. The modern design of the roof of the proposed extension incorporating mono-pitch sections and a flat portion would sit also awkwardly with the distinctive Victorian architecture of the building. The proposed extension would also have modern doors, poorly-proportioned windows and lack the detailing of the existing building. The appellants' offer to amend some elements of the design was considered inadequate. Although partially screened by an existing high boundary wall along the property frontage, the upper parts of the proposed extension would still be visible. The Inspector considered that the harm arising from the proposed extension would be significant and permanent, and would adversely affect the heritage interest of the BOLI for present and future generations.
- 2.4 The Inspector concluded that the proposed extension would fail to make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment and would not be a high quality design that respected the character and appearance of the local area, contrary to adopted planning policies. The Inspector therefore agreed with the Council that planning permission should be withheld for this element of the proposals. Since the proposed garage alterations were acceptable and unobjectionable the Inspector considered that this element should be approved and that a split decision was warranted. Overall, the Inspector agreed with the Council's assessment and consideration of the application.

DECISION : SPLIT - APPEAL DISMISSED FOR SIDE EXTENSION & APPEAL ALLOWED FOR GARAGE ALTERATIONS.

3. Recommendation

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

Tim Mills
Head of Economy, Planning and Strategic Housing