

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2022

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/22/3299609

61 Weir Road, Hartley Wintney, Hampshire, RG27 8ES

- 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 & Mrs J Goddard against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00228/HOU, dated 2 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and single-storey front extension to the existing property, with one additional car parking space added to the existing driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side and single-storey front extension to the existing property, with one additional car parking space added to the existing driveway at 61 Weir Road, Hartley Wintney, Hampshire, RG27 8ES in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/00228/HOU, dated 2 February 2022, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. Weir Road leads from Mabbs Lane into a mature residential estate comprised of a mixture of semi-detached brick-built two-storey dwellings and largely semi-detached bungalows. At its southern end, Weir Road forms a loop and the appeal property, which is a semi-detached dwelling, stands on one of the corners forming the loop. The property is slightly elevated above the highway, and the whole length of its western frontage displays a tall, mature cupressus leylandii hedge.
4. The intention is to build a two storey extension between the dwelling's gabled end and the highway. A single storey extension forming a porch would wrap around at the front.
5. The extension's footprint would be indented at the corner. The effect of this would be to effectively break up the perceived mass of the two storey extensions at its western end. The extension's main ridge would be set at a lower level than that of the dwelling, as would its eaves, so as to successfully

achieve subservience. As the appellant points out, the proposal's scale and design is not dissimilar to another scheme in the street recently granted planning permission by the Council¹.

6. To my mind, the extensions have been thoughtfully designed, complementing the design of the host property. Whilst the extended dwelling would stand closer to the highway making it more prominent than the existing, the resultant development in view of its acceptable, proportionate design would sit comfortably in its visual and spatial context. Although I do not entirely share the appellant's optimism on the retention of some parts of the mature hedge, most of it would be retained along the western frontage so as to provide, as now, a level of screening.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. Accordingly, I find no conflict with those provisions of policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, or policy 2 of the Hartley Wintney Neighbourhood Plan requiring new development to be sensitive to its surroundings, in keeping with local character and proportionate to the scale and character of surrounding buildings.

Conditions

8. In the interests of visual amenity, I shall impose the Council's suggested condition in respect of external materials.
9. It is also necessary, in the interests of certainty that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
10. The Council's suggested condition in respect of parking shall be imposed in the interests of highway safety, albeit in a slightly modified form.

Other matters

11. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representations including the objection made by the Parish Council. I disagree with them on the design issue for the reasons set out above, and I share the Local Planning Authority's view that the parking arrangements are acceptable. No other matter raised outweighs those considerations which led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ At 4 Weir Road

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1). The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2). The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following approved plans: Plan Ref: 002 PL02; 010 PL03; 011 PL03; 001 PL01; 003 PL01; 004 PL01; 005 PL01; 012 PL04; 013 PL04; 020 PL04; 011 PL05 & 021 PL01.
- 3). The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4). The car parking spaces shown on approved plan Ref: 011 PL05 shall be retained solely for car parking and shall not be used for any other purpose.