
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/20/3261077

114 Gally Hill Road, Church Crookham, Fleet GU52 6RX

- 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 and Mrs Phillips against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01149/HOU, dated 19 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is new front and side boundary treatment and entrance gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new front and side boundary treatment and entrance gates at 114 Gally Hill Road, Church Crookham, Fleet GU52 6RX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01149/HOU, dated 19 May 2020, and the plan submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Working Drawing 01.

Procedural Matters

2. Following the appeal submission, the Council has confirmed that Policy NBE8 of the *Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032* (2020) (HLPSS), which relates to historic environment, was erroneously included within the Council's reason for refusal. I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.
3. The Council has also confirmed that Policy GEN1, referred to in the reason for refusal, relates to the *Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 Saved Policies* (2020) (HLPR). I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a detached, two storey, contemporary-designed dwelling. It is set back from the site frontage behind a hard-surfaced parking

area immediately in front of the house and a grassed front garden adjacent to the site frontage.

6. The site lies within a residential area, and forms part of a row of dwellings of mixed designs and heights, fronting onto Gally Hill Road. Within this particular stretch of the road, between Malthouse Roundabout and Malthouse Bridge, site frontages are generally enclosed. There are various forms of boundary treatment, including brick walls, close-boarded vertical fencing, panel fencing and mature hedging and trees. The appeal site stands out as an anomaly, having a completely open frontage.
7. The appellant has provided evidence (courtesy of Google Streetview) that close-boarded fencing, of a similar height and position to that of the appeal scheme, enclosed the site frontage in June 2019. The appellant has confirmed that this was removed in March 2020, following damage beyond repair. Further evidence of former frontage fencing is suggested in the site planning history, which includes permission granted in 2015 for the replacement of existing front fencing with a 1.5m high timber fence with the driveway access swapped to the opposite side. As such, I am satisfied that frontage fencing has been a characteristic of the appeal site previously.
8. Soft landscaping is a feature of property frontages within the site vicinity. The proposal would enable the retention of the grassed roadside verge in front of the site and a mature tree and grassed front garden area within the site, so that no erosion of the soft-landscaping within the setting of the site would occur as a direct result of the development.
9. The contemporary design of the appeal scheme would reflect that of the host dwelling and the neighbouring property at no.116. The horizontal timber panels, and rendered and metal-capped piers would be in keeping with the materials of both these houses, which, due to the height of the proposal, would remain visible as a backdrop to the fencing and gates in views from the street.
10. In light of the above, I find that the appeal scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would accord with HLPSS Policy NBE9, HLP Policy GEN1 and Policy 10 of the *Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2032* (2019). These policies, amongst other things, aim to ensure that development proposals achieve a high quality design, are in keeping with the local character by virtue of their scale, design, height, prominence, materials, landscaping and siting, and complement and are well-integrated with neighbouring properties in the immediate locality.
11. For similar reasons, the development accords with guidance in Chapter 12 of the Framework which requires high quality design.

Other Matters

12. I have acknowledged third party concerns in respect of highway safety. The Highway Authority has raised no objection, and, following my site inspection, I am satisfied on this issue.

Conditions

13. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the national Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard

implementation condition, it is necessary to define the plan in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR