



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/25/3361701

5 Stoney Close, Yateley, Hampshire, GU46 6DR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Colin Timberlake against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 24/02165/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extruded aluminium carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an extruded aluminium carport at 5 Stoney Close, Yateley, Hampshire, GU46 6DR, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/02165/HOU and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans dated 04.11.2024.
 2. The sides and rear of the car port shall remain open and shall not be enclosed in any way.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed car port on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey house in a terrace of three situated towards the end of a short residential cul-de-sac of similar properties. It is proposed to erect a metal frame car port over a parking space at the front of the property. The application is partly retrospective in that at the time of the site visit the metal frame was in place but not the proposed polycarbonate roof.

Effect on character and appearance

4. The front gardens of these groups of houses tend to be subdivided by mature evergreen hedges about 2m high and which appear well maintained. Moreover, as the site lies towards the end of the cul-de-sac, public views of the structure are limited and the main impact would be on the adjoining properties and on the western side of the Close.

5. Although the structure is sited in front of the established building line in the terrace, its limited extent and height, together with its open nature and the use of metal of a matt dark colour, mean that it would not have an imposing or materially harmful visual impact on the local enclave of the street-scene. It would not be an incongruous and discordant feature as the Council suggests.
6. Objections from neighbours at application stage say that the proposal would set an undesirable precedent but other proposals of a similar ilk are unlikely to have a harmful cumulative effect given the hedge screen of housing groups, and in any event each proposal has to be considered on its individual merits.
7. Overall I find that the proposal would reflect the qualities of and is sensitive to the surroundings of the site and there is no conflict with the criteria set out in Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan on design matters, or the provisions of Policy YDNFP4 of the Neighbourhood Plan on design principles.

Conclusions

8. The accord with the development plan is not outweighed by any other consideration and this indicates that the appeal should be allowed.
9. In terms of the conditions, the Council recommends three but one regulating the start of development is not necessary as it already has been. However, I agree with the Council that conditions setting out that the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans, and that the sides and rear of the structure shall always remain open with no infilling, are necessary so as to maintain the appearance of the area. I will impose these conditions.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR