
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2020

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1750/D/19/3235068

91 Cranmore Lane, Aldershot GU11 3AP

- 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 Ms Rachel Faulkner against the decision of Rushmoor Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00368/FULPP, dated 11 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension to an existing semi detached house. Alterations to detached garage to form store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a single storey side extension to an existing semi detached house at 91 Cranmore Lane, Aldershot GU11 3AP. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to alterations to detached garage to form store at 91 Cranmore Lane, Aldershot GU11 3AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00368/FULPP, dated 11 June 2019, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The alterations to the garage hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with re-edged location plan and drawing number CL/01C (excluding the extension).

Procedural Matters

2. It is not the purpose of this type of appeal to make a determination as to whether the alterations to the garage would require planning permission. Accordingly, this appeal has just considered the merits of this part of the proposal. The application form submitted with the appeal contains no declaration date section. For the avoidance of doubt, the date of the application above has been taken from the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a Victorian semi-detached dwelling which is two storey with a frontage small scale dormer and rooflight at second floor within its roof. Additionally, the dwelling has a window within its flank gable at the second floor and an extension to the rear.
5. The dwelling has a prominent gable and adjacent gabled timber and glazed entrance porch on its frontage. It is constructed with red brick in a Flemish bond with painted ashlar quoins and window surrounds, and clay tile roof. There is a diamond brick pattern and decorative pierced bargeboards to its gable. Windows consist of timber mullion and transom windows and a centrally placed brick chimney stack with decorative detailing.
6. The neighbouring semi-detached dwelling is similar in design, form and use of materials. Both dwellings are locally listed and aesthetically attractive due to their design and have historical, architectural and evidential qualities. By reason of these qualities, the appeal dwelling has heritage significance as a non-designated heritage asset.
7. The proposal would result in the removal of a side bay window and the erection of a single storey extension spanning much of the dwelling's depth. Such an expanse would dominate the side of the dwelling. The extension's roof would comprise sloping mono-pitch sections wrapped around a flatted area which would be adjacent to the flank of the dwelling. Such a roof design would sit awkwardly with the distinctive Victorian architecture of the dwelling, with its steeply pitched roof. At ground floor, there would be expansive modern side doors with little mullion and transom detailing. Additionally, there would be a poorly proportioned tall narrow window fronting onto the main road.
8. The appellant's offer to improve the design of the glazed side doors would overcome much of their poor fenestration detailing but the odd-shaped frontage window would remain. Of more importance, the adverse impact arising from the size and roof design of the extension would remain.
9. There is an existing high boundary along the frontage which would screen much of the extension from the road. However, the upper part of the extension, including its roof, would still be visible from the road due to its height. Furthermore, the lack of a development's visibility from a public vantage point is not the only means of judging acceptability. In this case, the harm arising from the extension would be significant and permanent, and would adversely affect the heritage interest of this asset for present and future generations.

Conclusion

10. For all these reasons, the extension would fail to make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment. It would not be a high quality design that respects the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to policy RE1 of the Rushmoor Local plan 2014-2032 (2019) and the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations to outweigh that finding.
11. However, the alterations to the garage on the site are acceptable and are severable from the scheme taken as a whole. Therefore, a split decision in this case is warranted. In respect of conditions for the garage alterations, it is

necessary to specify the approved plans for the avoidance of uncertainty and to allow for applications for minor material amendments. No materials condition is required as the plans indicate that they will match existing. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the alterations to the garage but dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey side extension.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR