



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/21/3286105

94 Gally Hill Road, Church Crookham, Fleet, GU52 6RU.

- 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 B. Maston against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01501/HOU, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is for extensions and alterations to existing dwelling and erection of boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 94 Gally Road is a detached chalet bungalow with an attached single garage/workshop. While facing Gally Hill Road it is located at its junction with Malthouse Close. The existing chalet is of a traditional design, sited in the centre of the plot and currently screened with dense hedging from the public realm.
4. While the development in Malthouse Close is more open plan, the development fronting Gally Road generally comprises a mix of more traditional properties screened by boundary planting. In contrast to the established character of the local housing stock I observed, on my site visit, what appeared to be a small development of two new dwellings, well designed and built to a striking contemporary design set on an open plot to the north west of the appeal site.
5. The appellant proposes the demolition of an existing conservatory addition together with the single garage/workshop and then the erection of a two-storey front and two-storey side extensions. It is also proposed to remove the existing traditional steep pitched roof and replace it a contemporary styled flat roof and two shallow pitched roofs either side. In addition, it is proposed to re-order the fenestration and replace part of the boundary fence with a wall with inset timber panels.

6. The roof of the dwelling as altered would be lower than the current ridge line of the host property. Nevertheless, the overall visual mass of the dwelling as extended would be much greater. The extensions would therefore not overall appear as a subservient addition to the host property. Indeed, it would have the appearance of a large replacement dwelling.
7. I agree with the Council that, particularly on a corner plot such as this a contemporary designed dwelling can, even in contrast to surrounding development be an appropriate design solution. However, it always needs to be, as those identified above, of a high-quality design and appropriate to its setting.
8. In my judgement, the house as extended, while not reflecting in anyway the established character of the surrounding buildings, would by reason of its three-dimensional form, overall massing and utilitarian bland facades, particularly the flank elevations due to their height, limited fenestration and lack of modelling, appear as a visually intrusive, incongruous and discordant addition to the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area.
9. I accept that subject to the retention of the existing boundary planting the dwelling as extended would to some extent be screened from the street. However, there is no guarantee that the screen planting would survive the construction of the proposed new wall or be retained in the long term.
10. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would cause harm to the street scene and the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore not accord with the objectives of Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategic Sites) 2032 (Adopted April 2020) and saved Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006–Saved Policies (April 2009) as they relate, to amongst other things, a requirement for development to achieve a high quality of design and positively contribute to the overall appearance of the local area.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR