



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 30 June 2021

by Mrs J Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P1750/D/21/3271631

68 Pierrefondes Avenue, Farnborough, GU14 8PA

- 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 Mr Jon Dapre against the decision of Rushmoor Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00830/FULPP, dated 3 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area is characterised by residential properties in a mix of styles. Houses in this part of Pierrefondes Avenue are set back from the roadside edge with front gardens which give an open, spacious character to the street scene.
4. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a flat roofed garage 4.5 metres wide by 5.7 metres in depth and with a height of around 2.5 metres. The position would be immediately adjacent to the site frontage with the whole structure several metres forward of the host dwelling and the properties either side.
5. Although the building line is not entirely consistent for all dwellings and there is a predominance of hard surfaced parking and turning areas the open nature of the street is softened by tree planting. The position of the property is close to a bend in the road and the garage would be prominent on the approach from either direction.
6. The introduction of a flat roofed garage of this dimension would significantly erode the open appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. Moreover, due to its scale and massing, it would appear as an incongruous form of development poorly related to existing buildings and at odds with the open character and appearance of this part of Pierrefondes Avenue.
7. The appellant points to other instances locally where garages are forward of the building line, those that I saw in the immediate area were set back from the site frontages with one exception. There is a garage/office building a short distance to the west which is located immediately adjacent to the footway. I

saw on my visit that this structure has been constructed with a sedum roof and is partially concealed by the fence which encloses the side garden to No.64. The Council in that case concluded that as only a small amount of that structure would be visible above the existing fence line it would not be unduly harmful, particularly given its location in the side garden and mainly concealed behind existing fencing. From the evidence before me I agree with that conclusion. In any event the circumstances of this appeal proposal differ from that scheme and whilst consistency is important, each case has to be determined on its individual merits.

8. The existing boundary planting between No. 68 and No. 66 has been highlighted by the appellant as screening for the garage. However, that vegetation would not provide effective screening particularly in the winter months. Consequently, a structure in this location would be prominent from either direction and would, in my view, be harmful to the appearance of the site, the wider street scene, and to the character of the area in general.
9. For these reasons the development would conflict with Policy DE1 of the Rushmoor Local Plan (2019), to the Rushmoor Borough Council Home Improvements and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2020), and to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, among other things to ensure that development makes a positive contribution towards improving the quality of the built environment and respects the character and appearance of the local area including respecting building lines.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has highlighted that the application was submitted in line with pre-application advice from the Council. I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate what advice was given and in any event the Council is not bound to follow informal advice when deciding a formal planning application.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Mrs J Wilson

INSPECTOR