



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

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

Decision date: 27th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/17/3172486 18 Crownfields, Odiham, Hook RG29 1PL

- 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 William Fraser-Ransley against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02991/FUL, dated 2 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, associated infrastructure and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, associated infrastructure and parking on land adjacent to 18 Crownfields at 18 Crownfields, Odiham, Hook RG29 1PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02991/FUL, dated 2 November, subject to the attached condition schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site lies within the urban settlement of Odiham. The area is residential in nature with a number of pairs of semi-detached properties set along the road. These are relatively modest, occupying generous plots, with large gaps between each pair, which overall provides a spacious and open character to the street scene.
4. A number of the properties in the street have been extended to the front, side and rear. Similarly some have constructed garages, and there are a variety of boundary treatments present. As a result, there is no uniform rhythm to properties along the road.
5. The proposal would introduce an additional pair of semi-detached houses, situated on land which previously formed the gardens of Nos 17 and 18 Crownfields. Their location would infill the gap between Nos 17 and 18, but would reflect the building line, being some five metres from the road.

Sufficient distance would be provided between the dwellings and their immediate neighbours to each side to ensure the proposal would maintain the open character and would not result in a terracing effect.

6. When first constructed, the properties along Crownfields would have had a uniform style and design. Although the original architectural style of the properties remains dominant, the properties as seen today are more varied in their appearance. The proposal would successfully reflect the overall form and design of the surrounding properties in respect of its scale and fenestration. There would be porches to the front, however these would be an attractive addition, and when viewed amongst the other alterations in the road, they would not appear incongruous.
7. The roof would be hipped with a flat top. However, the flat top would not be particularly visible when viewed from the road, therefore the roofline would be in general keeping with the neighbouring properties. The proposal would also be slightly deeper than others in order to comply with National Space Standards. However, this increase in depth would have little effect on the appearance of the proposed dwellings from the road due to the neighbouring properties either side. Furthermore, due to the slight variations in built form along the road there is no clear rear building line. Therefore I do not consider that the depth of the proposal would harm the appearance of the area with particular regard to the rear elevation.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area with regards to its scale, design, massing, height and siting. It would therefore comply with Policies GEN1 and GEN4 of the Hart District Council Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006 (the Local Plan), and Policy URB12, in respect of providing a positive relationship to the surrounding buildings and spaces.

Highway safety

9. Crownfields is a relatively narrow road with no parking restrictions and the majority of houses provide an element of off-street parking. The proposal would provide two parking spaces in tandem for occupiers of the properties along the side boundary of each plot. An additional parking space has been provided for visitors, which would result in three spaces in line.
10. The Highway's Officer has not raised any concerns relating to the parking provision and I attach weight to their assessment. Having looked at the site and the surrounding area, I consider that the provision of parking in a tandem layout would not result in difficulty in manoeuvrability. Site lines along the road are adequate as it is a straight road with limited levels of traffic, where, due to the nature of the road and on-road parking, it is necessary to travel slowly. Drivers would have sufficient time to assess oncoming vehicles, and accordingly I consider that those accessing the site would be able to do so without endangering themselves or other road users.
11. The Appellant has suggested that it would be possible to provide a parking space at the front of the property for visitors. However, I consider that this would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area as very few houses provide parking directly in front of the principal elevation, and the soft landscaping that makes up a number of boundary treatments along the road

enhances the character of the area. Accordingly, I do not intend to require an amendment to the parking provision.

12. I have considered the concerns regarding parking issues, and access for refuse and emergency vehicles. On the evidence before me I consider that the proposal would not materially affect Crownfields in respect of current parking and access.
13. Taking into account the Council's guidance which requires 2.5 spaces per unit, and the option to park on the road, I find that the proposal would comply with Policy GEN 1 of the Local Plan, and the Council's Parking Provision Interim Guidance 2008.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered in accordance with the advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. As a result I have amended some of them for clarity.
15. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. Conditions to secure finishing materials and landscaping are necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area and surrounding living conditions.
16. Conditions securing a Construction Management Plan, hours of work and parking provision are necessary to ensure there are no significant adverse impacts upon the living conditions of local residents, or upon the highway.
17. Conditions 2, 3, 4 and 5 are pre-commencement conditions which are justified in this case as they cover matters that are essential to be agreed before the development starts.

Conclusions

18. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plan nos. and documents:
Location Plan;
Block Plan;
PCA16/1913/01 – Proposed ground floor plans;
PCA16/1913/02 – Proposed first floor plans;
PCA16/1913/03 – Proposed elevations;
PCA16/1913/04 – Proposed street scene;
PCA16/1913/05 – Proposed sections;
Design and Access Statement.
- 3) No development shall take place until details and samples of all external materials surfaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with approved details.
- 4) No development shall commence until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:
 - i) earthworks showing existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
 - ii) means of enclosure and retaining structures;
 - iii) boundary treatments;
 - iv) vehicle parking layouts;
 - v) pedestrian access;
 - vi) hard surfacing materials;
 - vii) minor artefacts and structures e.g. refuse or other storage units, etc.

Details of soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants noting species, plant supply sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate.

The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before any part of the development is first occupied in accordance with the agreed implementation programme.
- 5) No development or site works shall take place on site until a 'Construction Method Statement' has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for: access to the site; the parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors; hours of construction, including deliveries, loading and construction of the development; the erection of any means of temporary enclosure or security hoarding and measures to prevent mud and debris being carried on to the public highway and ways to minimise pollution. The

development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the measures detailed within the statement.

- 6) Construction works shall take place only between 0730 hours to 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, between 0800 to 1300 on Saturday, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
- 7) The approved parking facilities for vehicles shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of motorised vehicles and access shall be maintained at all times to allow them to be used as such.

END OF CONDITION SCHEDULE