

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2022

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/22/3302464

6 Nursery Terrace, Hook Road, North Warnborough, Hook, RG29 1ER

- 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 Miss Virginia Ash against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00638/HOU, dated 21 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a single storey kitchen extension to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the North Warnborough Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling. The terrace is comprised of modest brick-built cottages, described in the CA Appraisal as being a positive building. I saw that the terrace was attractive in its proportions, albeit some roof modifications/additions had taken place and the original brickwork of the two northernmost cottages, including the appeal property, had been painted over.
4. The appellant proposes a single-storey rear addition. I do not consider the scale of the proposal to be objectionable. However, in view of the age of the host property, the appellant's design approach, particularly in her use of materials, was to emphasize that the proposal was read as an extension '*and not part of the original building*'. In this respect the walls would be comprised of a '*yellow*' brick with what is described as a '*synthetic*' clay tiled roof and a glazed powder coated aluminum framed rear elevation.
5. The appellant to my mind would succeed in achieving her objective of making the extension stand out, were it built, but that does not make the development acceptable considering its heritage context. Whilst I share the appellant's point that the extension would not be prominent, from where it could be clearly seen – from close quarters, from the publicly accessible land to the north and west,

and when approaching from the north along Hook Road by car or on foot, it would appear incongruous and disharmonious in its spatial and visual context on account of the contrasting and inappropriate materials chosen.

6. The sensitive use of appropriate materials in a conservation context is an essential part of the design process, and the Framework¹ advises that development that is not well designed should be refused. I intend to follow that advice in this instance.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would prove harmful, if implemented, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
8. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of policy NBE8 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 and policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 requiring new development to conserve or enhance heritage assets, and to be in keeping with local character.
9. The harm that I have found is less than substantial, but I have not been made aware of any public benefits arising from the proposal, if implemented. Indeed, it appears to me that only the private benefits accruing to the appellants would arise.

Other matters

10. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representations including the objections made by neighbouring residents and those of the Parish Council.
11. Whilst I largely share the objectors' views on the effect on local character and heritage asset, I note from the officer report on the application that the Local Planning Authority assessed the possible impacts on residential living conditions and raised no objection. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment on this issue. Residents' submissions in respect of access appear to me to relate to a private legal issue rather than a planning matter.
12. The appellant refers to a lack of communication from the Council during the determination of this, the second application for an extension. However, I also note that the applicant did not pursue a pre-application discourse with the Council prior to the second submission. This may have proved to be the wisest course.
13. Although reference has been made to other development plan policies, I consider those to which I have referred to be the most relevant.
14. No other matter raised outweighs those considerations which led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework 2021