



South Downs
National Park Authority
Agenda Item 10
Report PC22/23-07

Report to **Planning Committee**
Date **8 September 2022**
By **Director of Planning**
Title of Report **Summary of appeal and Judicial Review decisions received from 15 April 2022 – 23 August 2022**
Purpose of Report **To update SDNPA Members on appeal decisions received**

Note

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to note the outcome of the appeal and Judicial Review decisions

I. Overview

- I.1 The attached table (**Appendix I**), ordered by date of decision, provides Members with a summary and brief commentary on the appeal decisions. This covers both those appeals dealt with by the host authorities and directly by the South Downs National Park Authority.
- I.2 From the 15 April 2022 to 23 August 2022:
- 16 appeal decisions (some dealt with concurrently) were received of which 13 were dismissed, 2 were allowed and in one case the Inspector declined to determine the appeal.
 - There were no judicial review judgements.
 - The Authority's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) team took one individual and one developer to court in the period for non payment of CIL. One of these debts has now been paid. 75% of the other debt has been paid following an adjourned court date. A rescheduled court date for the remaining balance is due in September.
- I.3 The Authority's appeal performance in the financial year to date is good with 88% of appeals being dismissed. The number of appeal decisions received by the Authority in the period is lower than previous years, presumably because of the current relatively long determination times by the Planning Inspectorate. This is the case across the country.

TIM SLANEY

Director of Planning

South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer: Mike Hughes
Tel: 01730 819325
Email: mike.hughes@southdowns.gov.uk
Appendices: I. Summary of Appeal Decisions

SDNPA Consultees: Legal Services; Director of Planning
External Consultees: None
Background Documents: None

Key to Appeals Reporting

Method of decision All are delegated decisions unless otherwise specified
Appeal method All are determined via written representations unless otherwise specified
Allowed A
Dismissed D

Planning Appeals	
Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/21/01499/FUL APP/Y9507/W/21/3286317
Authority:	Chichester
Site:	Woodmansgreen Farm, Linch Road, Woodmansgreen, Linch, Liphook, West Sussex GU30 7NF
Description of Development:	The development proposed is described as ‘the erection of a replacement storage barn’.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 23 May 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were the effect of the proposal on the landscape and whether the proposal would preserve the setting of Grade II listed farm buildings.
- The farmstead was identified to be a fine example of the local vernacular and an important feature in the landscape. The proposal, the Inspector found, would be a jarring feature with a wider plan form, uncharacteristic shallow pitched roof and dominant bulk and massing. It would be apparent from a public footpath and highway. The proposal would harm landscape character.
- The Inspector considered that whilst landscaping can be used to mitigate the impacts of a proposal, perhaps by softening and anchoring it in the landscape, it would nevertheless be unwise to seek to hide an otherwise unacceptable building in this way.
- The proposal would harm the setting of a very well-preserved historic farmstead that has considerable historic and evidential value and significance, including through harming the way its historic and aesthetic value is experienced, understood, and experienced.
- The Inspector found that the benefits of the building would be insufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified to the setting of the listed buildings.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/21/03427/HOUS APP/Y9507/D/22/3290067
Authority:	Chichester
Site:	Mottistone Cottage, Terwick Hill, Rogate, GU31 5EJ
Description of Development:	Erection of a new oak framed garage provided by English Heritage Oak.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 24 May 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issue was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The area was identified to have a rural character and appearance.
- The Inspector found that, due to the substantial scale and prominent siting, the proposed 3 bay garage with roof accommodation would harmfully erode the important openness between the dwelling and the road. It would have an urbanising effect which would damage the natural beauty and landscape character of its surroundings. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	Appeal A: SDNP/20/04174/HOUS APP/Y9507/W/21/3286868
Authority:	Winchester
Site:	Soberton Mill, Mill 10m South West of Mill House, Wickham Road, Swanmore SO32 2QF
Description of Development:	The development proposed is conservation, alterations and additions to Soberton Mill to provide ancillary accommodation for use in connection with The Manor (Soberton Mill House).
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 30 May 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II Listed building, and the effect on protected species.
- The Inspector found that while the structure is in a very poor state of repair and despite numerous alterations, the building retains several elements acting as testimony of its previous use. Although the south-east façade and gables to the south-west and north-east would undergo relatively limited changes, the proposal would significantly alter the character and appearance of the north-west elevation, resulting in an overtly domestic appearance. This would dilute its original character as a functional, industrial building, to the detriment of its significance as a heritage asset.
- This would result in ‘less than substantial’ harm, which would not be outweighed by the proposal enabling the building to be brought back into use due to the use being very much a private benefit.
- The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment Survey ascertained the presence of bat roosts within the appeal building. Further bat emergence and re-entry surveys were recommended by these, although have not yet been carried out. The Inspector concluded that the matter could not be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of a condition and noted that further mitigation measures may be required. Therefore the proposal was also in conflict with paragraph 180 of the NPPF.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	Appeal B: SDNP/20/04175/LIS APP/Y9507/Y/21/3286869
Authority:	Winchester
Site:	Soberton Mill, Mill 10m South West of Mill House, Wickham Road, Swanmore SO32 2QF
Description of Development:	The development proposed is conservation, alterations and additions to Soberton Mill to provide ancillary accommodation for use in connection with The Manor (Soberton Mill House).
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 30 May 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues, in this appeal against the non determination of listed building consent, were whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II Listed building.
- The Inspector found that while the structure is in a very poor state of repair and despite numerous alterations, the building retains several elements acting as testimony of its previous use. Although the south-east façade and gables to the south-west and north-east would undergo relatively limited changes, the proposal would significant alter the character and appearance of the north-west elevation, resulting in an overtly domestic appearance. This would dilute its original character as a functional, industrial building, to the detriment of its significance as a heritage asset.
- This harm was found to be further exacerbated by the proposed changes to the internal layout, which would unacceptably erode the appreciation and understanding of this former industrial structure.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/20/01635/LDP APP/Y9507/X/20/3259115
Authority:	Chichester
Site:	Kennels Farm, Selham Road, West Lavington, Midhurst GU29 0AU
Description of Development:	The use for which a certificate of lawful use or development is sought is the proposed use of buildings at Kennels Farm as Estate Maintenance yard including a joinery workshop, painters' workshop, stores, and offices.
Decision and Date of Decision:	A 10 June 2022 (Informal hearing)

Inspector's Reasoning:

- The main issue was whether the refusal to grant the Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) was well founded.
- The application for an LDC was made on the basis that the agricultural use of Kennels Farm, West Lavington, and the use of the existing Estate's Maintenance Yard at Easebourne, are within the same Planning Unit (which has been identified within a 'Core Area' of the Estate). Consequently, the appeal turned on an understanding of the correct Planning Unit.
- The Inspector highlighted the importance of case law in *Burdle & Williams v SSE & New Forest DC* [1972] 1 WLR 1207 in understanding of the Planning Unit. This suggested three broad categories of distinction:
 - A single planning unit where the unit of occupation has one primary use, and any other activities are incidental or ancillary;
 - A single planning unit that is in a mixed used because the land is put to two or more activities, and it is not possible to say that one is incidental to the another; and
 - The unit of occupation comprises two or more physically separate areas which are occupied for different and unrelated purposes. Each area that has a different primary use ought to be considered as a separate planning unit.
- The 'Core Area' advised by the appellant, comprised land uses and enterprises centred around the historic buildings and parkland at the centre of the estate. These include the Polo Club, Cowdray House, Cowdray Hall and Therapy Rooms, the Farm Shop and Café, Estate Office and Maintenance Yard. The in-hand farmland and woodland (including Kennels Farm) is within this Core. The Inspector noted that the Cowdray Estate brand was clearly noticeable within the core and that these uses and buildings were all within a single unit of occupation.

- The Inspector agreed with the Appellant, finding that the Core is a single, mixed-use planning unit, with a number of main composite units and several ancillary functions. The Inspector reasoned that on the balance of probability, a functional relationship exists across the Estate including Kennels Farm. This conclusion was based on the assessment that the Core identified was not a newly created entity, but an area which formed part of an historic estate which had evolved over a century where both Kennels Farm and the Maintenance Yard had always been an integral part. All components of business within the Core share a common/centralised administrative service which fall under a single CEO.
- The strong, functional relationships between uses such as Kennels Farm and the Polo Grounds, which the Authority contended had their own distinct character and occupied well-defined areas of land, were ultimately considered to be an overriding reason for them to comprise part of a single mixed use Planning Unit. The proposal amounts to a reshuffling of uses, rather than an intensification of the uses.
- On the balance of probabilities, given the functional and physical relationships of the Estate Maintenance Yard to the various components of the business within the Core, together with the overarching control of Estate on these components (through its administration, financing, marketing and maintenance of the Core Estate land and buildings), the Inspector concluded the existing Estate Maintenance Yard and Kennels Farm are situated within a single mixed use planning unit and the relocation of the Estate’s Maintenance Yard was not “Development” for the purposes of Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/21/02853/FUL APP/Y9507/W/21/3283479
Authority:	SDNPA
Site:	Land North of Mount Way, Lancing, BN15 0QD
Description of Development:	The development proposed is for the erection of a single dwelling with associated landscaping, vehicle parking and improvements to existing access.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 16 June 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were the suitability of the location, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the impact on the Lancing Ring Nature Reserve.
- The site was identified to be in the countryside for planning purposes, for which no exceptional circumstances applied under policy SD25.

- The Inspector considered that the design and materials in the locality were varied and the proposed dwelling would make effective use of the topography. The design, materials, bulk and massing were deemed acceptable.
- The site was identified to currently have low ecological value however it acts as a valuable transition space to the SDNP boundary and with appropriate management it is highly likely to recover as either chalk grassland or ecological woodland/scrub buffer. The proposed pond, roosting boxes, log piles and other features would not provide adequate mitigation or compensate for the proposal which included extensive hardstandings and opportunities for domestic paraphernalia. It would result in irreversible harm to the Nature Reserve and potential chalk grassland habitat, contrary to policy SD9 and chapter 15 of the NPPF.
- The provision of one new ‘windfall’ dwelling would not outweigh the identified harm.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/20/02154/FUL APP/Y9507/W/21/3273249
Authority:	SDNPA
Site:	High Stoke, Holden Lane, Beauworth, SO24 0PB
Description of Development:	The development proposed is for the demolition of the existing dwelling house and the removal of the existing tennis court. The erection of a 6 bedroom contemporary replacement dwelling house in a revised location. To include the laying of a driveway and forecourt, engineering works for the purpose of landscaping throughout the plot, the creation of a dew pond, and a new outside swimming pool to the rear with pool house.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 20 June 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character appearance of the area, with particular regard to its location within the SDNP, and any impact on protected species (bats).
- The proposed development would have awkward and angular elements including mono-pitch and flat roof extensions and prominent garage doors, extending across the width of the plot, which would appear alien in the rural and open landscape character of the SDNP. These elements would not only be glimpsed from the well-used South Downs Way through the relatively wide access and driveway but also from wider public vantage points within the SDNP.

- The Inspector did not agree with the appellant that the development would be seen as a point of interest. Rather, they found that in this sensitive and low-density countryside location, the raised and bulky development would unnaturally draw the eye to the more urban-type features of the proposal. The proposed wildflower meadow and other landscaping would not be adequate mitigation to overcome this and the harm caused by the range of domestic paraphernalia on view.
- With regard to protected species, the Inspector considered that the SDNPA’s suggested condition would ensure the proposal would meet the aims of relevant policies and the NPPF.
- The inspector afforded very limited weight to the potential ‘fall-back’ position, which would be for the erection of an extension and a number of outbuildings, owing to the proposed 2-storey dwelling and pool house being of a very different character and nature.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/20/05607/FUL APP/Y9507/W/21/3283414
Authority:	SDNPA
Site:	Freshcombe Lodge, Truleigh Hill, Shoreham BN43 5FB
Description of Development:	The development proposed is for the replacement stable building, change of use of land to provide a 20m x 40m sand school, creation of a butterfly bank, wildflower meadow and wildlife corridor.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 20 June 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were the effect on the character and appearance of the area, with particular reference to the SDNP and groundwater sources and features.
- The character was typified by rolling arable fields and sparse rural-type development. These is established equestrian development.
- The stable element would elongate the foot-print of the built form in a highly sensitive location and be at odds with the open and rolling countryside where development is mostly limited.

- The Inspector found that the sand school and equestrian paraphernalia would detract from the mostly unencumbered nature of the adjacent fields and ‘windswept spaciousness’ of the SDNP in this location, notwithstanding the grazing, telecommunications equipment and existing equestrian development. The excavation and construction works to create the sand school would also be harmful to the undulating topography and related character.
- The site lies within an Aquifer Partnership Area, Source Protection Zone and Nitrate Vulnerable Zone. The Inspector could not be certain that the appellants’ approach would reduce potential contamination even if secured by condition, therefore took a precautionary stance and identified conflict with policies SD17 and SD24 of the Local Plan and the first purpose of the National Park.
- The proposed consolidation of paddocks to reduce grazing, opportunities to exercise horses on site and ecological benefits were considered not to outweigh the harm identified.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/19/05954/FUL APP/Y9507/W/21/3280696
Authority:	SDNPA
Site:	Land to the north of 21 Mill Hill, Shoreham by Sea BN43 5TG
Description of Development:	The development proposed is for the erection of a zero emissions single-storey home.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 21 June 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were whether the development was in a suitable location, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers.
- Whilst the Inspector agreed with both parties that the proposal would not be ‘isolated’, despite being outside of the settlement boundary, the Inspector was not persuaded that the new dwelling would be of any particular merit. They found the proposal would serve to intensify the adjacent line of built form that would remove the current role the plot plays as a transition space to the open countryside beyond.
- The proposal would appear as a stark addition to the modest built form along Mill Lane and would be at odds with the open character and spaciousness of the SDNP. The inspector agreed with the SDNPA that the scale, mass and appearance of the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.

- The privacy of future occupiers was considered to be eroded by the existing raised terrace of the adjoining plot, thereby causing harm to the living conditions of future occupiers.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	Appeal A SDNP/20/04086/HOUS APP/Y9507/W/21/3282444
Authority:	Chichester
Site:	Cokes Barn, West Burton Road, West Burton RH20 1HD
Description of Development:	The development proposed is car port and cycle store.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 21 June 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of Cokes Barn (Grade II), Cokes Cottage (Grade II) and Cooke’s House (Grade II*). The group value of these buildings also forms part of their significance as they would have historically formed part of a traditional farmstead. They make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the West Burton Conservation Area. The Inspector also considered the effect of the proposal on protected species and protected trees.
- The Inspector found that the proposal would exacerbate the extent to which the historic significance of the barn had previously been eroded by extensions and alterations as a result of the garage and cycle store’s excessive footprint and scale. It would appear as an overtly domestic feature that would detract from the agricultural character of the immediate surroundings. This would harmfully erode the ability to understand and appreciate the special interest of the listed building and the former farmstead as a whole.
- Structures in the proximity of the site, as well as existing mature vegetation, suggest that the site may support protected species such as bats. No survey evidence was submitted to support the appellant’s position that no evidence of recent bat activity has been found. As such, the Inspector was unable to determine with certainty that the proposals would not have an adverse effect upon protected species and therefore found the proposal would not accord with the requirements of the Local Plan. Similarly, there is no evidence to confirm the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the trees in close proximity.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	Appeal B: SDNP/20/04087/LIS APP/Y9507/Y/21/3282447
Authority:	Chichester
Site:	Cokes Barn, West Burton Road, West Burton RH20 1HD
Description of Development:	The works proposed are car port and cycle store.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 21 June 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues, in this appeal against the refusal of listed building consent, were whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of Cokes Barn (Grade II), Cokes Cottage (Grade II) and Cooke’s House (Grade II*). The group value of these buildings also forms part of their significance as they would have historically formed part of a traditional farmstead. They make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the West Burton Conservation Area.
- The Inspector found that the proposal would exacerbate the extent to which the historic significance of the barn had previously been eroded by extensions and alterations as a result of the garage and cycle store’s excessive footprint and scale. It would appear as an overtly domestic feature that would detract from the agricultural character of the immediate surroundings. This would harmfully erode the ability to understand and appreciate the special interest of the listed building and the former farmstead as a whole.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/21/03144/CND APP/Y9507/W/21/3288984
Authority:	SDNPA
Site:	Upland Park, Garrison Hill, Droxford SO32 3QL
Description of Development:	The application sought planning permission for 22 self contained holiday lodges together with an on-site manager's lodge, facilities/reception buildings and spa with parking and landscaping improvement following demolition of vacant hotel buildings without complying with conditions attached to planning permission Ref SDNP/16/04613/FUL, dated 18 September 2017. The conditions in dispute are Nos 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26.
Decision and Date of Decision:	Declined to determine 21 June 2022

Inspector's Reasoning:

- Section 73 applications are considered dependent upon whether they are 'minor material amendments'. Planning Practice Guidance notes there is no statutory definition of a 'minor material amendment' but that it is likely to include any amendment where its scale and/or nature results in a development which is not substantially different from the one that has been approved.
- The Authority did not consider the application to represent a minor material amendment and the Inspector agreed explaining that although the scale of the holiday lodges had decreased (from 2/3 storeys to one storey) the relevant consideration is how different the scale is to that as approved; not whether the scale has increased or decreased. In this instance it was noted that the scale would substantially decrease. The nature of the proposal would also be substantially different as the proposed new location of some of the lodges would result in a substantial change to their nature and scale and the proposed landscaping and car parking would also substantially change.
- The Inspector agreed with the Authority that the appeal scheme did not represent a minor material amendment and that it could not have been granted by SDNPA. Given this the Inspector declined to determine the appeal, using powers under Section 79 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/20/04881/HOUS APP/Y9507/W/21/3281735
Authority:	Winchester
Site:	2 Manor Farm Cottages, Church Lane, Exton S032 3NU
Description of Development:	The development proposed is for a first-floor side extension
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 22 June 2022

Inspector’s Reasoning:

- The main issues were whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Exton Conservation Area and the cultural heritage of the SDNP, as well as the effect on the setting of the surrounding listed buildings.
- The Inspector found that whilst the proposed extension would be relatively modest, it would approximately double the width of the host dwelling, which would be at odds with the unassuming cottages in this part of the conservation area. Further, the bulky pitched-roof proposal would unbalance the pair of simple, yet attractive, unlisted dwellings in this highly prominent location. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the conservation area, and would result in harm to the cultural heritage of the SDNP.
- The Inspector agreed with the SDNPA that the extensive proposal would be in close proximity to the Church, and in permanently eroding an important view over the existing garage to the Church, would result in unacceptable harm to its significance and setting.
- In the planning balance, the Inspector determined the proposal would cause ‘less than substantial’ harm to heritage assets, which would not be outweighed by the limited biodiversity enhancements and short-term employment opportunities associated with the proposed development.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/21/01877/FUL APP/Y9507/W/21/3283123
Authority:	Chichester
Site:	Rew Cottage, Hesworth Common Lane, Fittleworth RH20 1EW
Description of Development:	The development proposed is realigned access road together with replacement gates.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 28 June 2022

Inspector's Reasoning:

- The main issue was the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. Planning permission was sought retrospectively.
- The site sits in proximity to Grade II listed buildings including a listed farmhouse, cottage and barns. The Inspector identified that the strong vernacular which characterises the historic buildings and surrounding landscape give the area an 'unspoilt and tranquil pastoral character', as described in the 2020 South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment.
- Access to the site was achievable across the front of a neighbouring property, with a further track providing agricultural and ancillary residential access. The realignment and widening of this track was the subject of the appeal.
- The development created a disproportionately large hardstanding area, electronically operated gates and planting which were considered to create an overtly suburban entrance, with a formal character that was at odds with the openness that characterised the area. The widened track encroached into the agricultural area, caused unacceptable harm to the landscape character and compromised the setting of the historic farmstead. This did not conserve or enhance the landscape character of the area nor represent a landscape-led approach.
- The inspector was not persuaded by the reliance upon on and off-site vegetative screening, or changing access needs for the agricultural land requiring larger vehicles, and deemed these did not justify the development. Accordingly the appeal was dismissed.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/20/05011/FUL APP/Y9507/W/21/3282351
Authority:	Chichester
Site:	Bittlesfield, Ebernoe Road, Balls Cross, Ebernoe GU28 9JU
Description of Development:	The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling, detached garage, including access, driveway, parking and amenity space, following the demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings.
Decision and Date of Decision:	D 21 July 2022

Inspector's Reasoning:

- The main issues considered in the appeal were the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the effect on the setting of the neighbouring listed building and the impact on dark night skies.
- The Inspector considered that the design of the replacement dwelling would fundamentally alter the character of this site which is currently occupied by a modest dwelling and associated buildings. It was considered that the scale of the proposed dwelling would be far in excess and out of proportion with the existing property and more traditional properties within the immediate area. The roof profile of the new dwelling, combined with its full length two storey design and three projecting two storey bays would have a significant visual massing and would be prominent from the highway, dominating the common land. This impact would be exacerbated by the visually large replacement garage structure. The scheme was found not to be landscape led and to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
- Acknowledging the new dwelling would be set 35m away from a listed building the Inspector noted that the new dwelling would increase the presence and bulk of built form on site and would mar the attractive and rural setting of the listed cottage. The scheme would result in a surrounding context that is almost suburban in character. The harm was identified as being 'less than substantial' and not outweighed by public benefits that provided clear and convincing justification for the harm.
- The proposal would reduce the extent of glazing relative to the present situation and a condition could be attached seeking further details of any external lighting.
- The Inspector found a modest benefit in terms of dark night skies but harm in relation to the character and appearance of the area (including landscape character) and harm to the setting of the adjacent listed building and dismissed the appeal.

Planning Application and Appeal Reference Number:	SDNP/21/05392/HOUS APP/Y9507/D/22/3294511
Authority:	SDNPA
Site:	129 Myrtle Grove, Long Furlough Lane, Patching, Worthing, BN13 3XL
Description of Development:	The development proposed is the removal of conservatory and outhouse and in their place erection of two-storey extension.
Decision and Date of Decision:	A 26 July 2022

Inspector's Reasoning:

- The sole issue in the appeal was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.
- The Inspector shared the Authority's view that some of the features found on this semi-detached property and its pair make the cottages attractive including the balanced disposition of prominent gables, chimneys, materials and roof shapes. However, the Inspector noted, the original appearance and distinction of the pair had been considerably devalued over time in particular by substantial ill fitting additions at the front and side and by inappropriate fenestration materials.
- The removal of the conservatory was considered to be a considerable benefit and the outbuilding's removal would reduce the level of local clutter. Turning to the proposal's design the Inspector considered that it respected the original features of the property and would read as an acceptably designed and proportionate addition. The Inspector did not consider that it would create a terracing effect as feared by the NPA and whilst noting the NPA's comments on lack of symmetry explained that that had already been significantly eroded by more modern additions. Accordingly it was held that the proposal was acceptable and the appeal was allowed.