

**“Westwood Edge”  
Highways Road  
Compton  
WINCHESTER  
Hampshire  
SO21 2DF**

The Planning Inspectorate  
Room 3B Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
BRISTOL  
BS1 6PN

**For the attention of Opirim Agala**

**23 November 2022**

Submitted online via <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Dear Sirs

**STRATTON, HIGHWAYS ROAD, COMPTON  
PLANNING APPLICATION 22/00932/HOU  
PLANNING APPEAL REFERENCE APP/L1765/D/22/3307967  
ENFORCEMENT APPEAL REFERENCE APP/L1765/C/22/3307930**

I acknowledge receipt of two letters from Winchester City Council informing me of the above appeals. Having studied the documents available upon the Council’s web-site, I make the following observations and urge you to refuse both appeals.

Within the *Appellant’s Statement of Case* a list appears entitled “The objections to the scheme concerned the following”. However, reference to my letter dated 05 June 2022 would clearly indicate that I also objected to the following two significant items which the appellant conspicuously ignores and fails to address.

- (a) The sheet metal roof does not comply with the planning approval (concrete roof tiles, colour to be agreed), is unsightly and deeply incongruous. The inspector’s appeal decision of 03 February 2022 stated “*Stratton is highly incongruous within the street scene and appears more akin to an aeronautical building in terms of its design, and through the extreme contrast and use of materials, namely the zinc roofing and grey painted render elevations ...* “. The appellant has made no attempt to respond to this criticism of the roof materials and continues to ignore this aspect of incongruity.
- (b) A commercial-scale flue has been added to the eastern flank of the building. Again this is unsightly and does not have planning approval.

From the applicant’s own figures, the building was constructed 0.93m (3 feet) higher than the ‘approved’ design, equivalent to 1/3 of a storey and representing a height increase of over 10%. Within the *Appellant’s Statement of Case* the proposed design revisions “will reduce the overall height of the roof by approximately 220mm”, that is, some 8½ inches. The statement does not quantify that this minor reduction would still result in the building being 0.71m (2’4”) higher than the approved value – well beyond construction tolerances and an apparently deliberate flouting of planning rules.

In addition to the foregoing, any such minor ridge reduction will have no effect upon the eaves height which would remain some 0.93m (3 feet) higher than approved. Accordingly, this minimal proposed revision would have negligible effect upon the perceived height and visual impact of the roof, which are exacerbated by the inappropriate choice of roof finish and colour.

The *Appellant's Statement of Case* avers that "The size, scale and height of the proposal is not significantly different to that previously approved". This is manifestly not the case when the building would be a significant 0.71m (2'4") higher than the approved design.

The *Appellant's Statement of Case* continues "The massing, materials and appearance do respond positively to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area". One could argue about the semantics of this statement, but at face value it is completely inaccurate. The massing, materials and appearance in fact bear no resemblance or relationship with either the original building or any of the surrounding structures.

Minimal alterations were proposed to the erroneously built form in the above planning application and all are insignificant. Furthermore, the 'Planning Statement' was extremely selective in addressing the inspector's comments. I therefore consider this design remains inappropriate in its context and not sufficiently innovative or interesting to be attractive or worthy of retention.

Finally, and for the avoidance of doubt, I strongly object to the current proposals and urge that both appeals be disallowed.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

**DAVID KNOTT**

Copies (via email only) to: [cataylor@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:cataylor@winchester.gov.uk) and [planning@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:planning@winchester.gov.uk)