

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

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

Decision date: 11th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/16/3157245
47 Broadshard Lane, Ringwood BH24 1RP

- 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 Bartlett Bonnett against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/10488, dated 7 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alterations to existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extensions and alterations to existing property at 47 Broadshard Lane, Ringwood BH24 1RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/10488, dated 7 April 2016, subject to the following 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 carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location / Site Plan Drawing No 47/10 dated August 2016,
 - Location / Block Plan Drawing No 47/02 Rev A dated March 2016,
 - Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No 47/03 Rev D dated March 2016,
 - Proposed Elevations Drawing No 47/04 Rev C dated March 2016,
 - Existing Plan and Elevations Drawing No 01 Rev A dated March 2016.
 - 3) The external facing materials shall match those used on the existing building.
 - 4) No development shall commence until a scheme of landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the boundary hedgerow on the site, identify the extent of it to be retained and set out measures for its protection throughout the course of development.
 - 5) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the extension or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
-

Procedural Matter

2. The application was amended after submission to change the gable to a hipped roof and omit a first floor window. The Council determined the application on the basis of the revised plans, which are now before me. I am satisfied that I can determine the appeal on this basis without prejudice to either party or those people who commented on the application.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of No 36 Northfield Road.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached bungalow occupying a corner plot in a residential area. The development comprises a single/two storey rear extension which requires raising the ridge height of the existing bungalow. The extension would be close to the boundary with No 36 Northfield Road and the Council considers that it would be imposing and intrusive to the detriment of the neighbouring occupiers' living conditions.
5. The gable of the neighbouring bungalow, at No 36, faces the rear of the appeal property and there is only one window in that gable. The window is obscured glazed and, during my site visit, the neighbour confirmed that it does not serve a main habitable room. Moreover, the extension would not be directly opposite this window and it would be unlikely to lead to a material loss of light.
6. The proposed extension would be very close to the shared boundary and it would extend beyond the rear wall of the neighbouring bungalow. However, the roof to the two storey element would be steeply pitched and hipped which would reduce the expanse of the gable wall. The single storey element would have a flat roof and would not be prominent. Although the two storey extension would be more visible than the existing house, it would not be overly dominant due to the design of the roof. Also, the part of the neighbour's garden that would be most affected is primarily used for access to the main area of useable garden space at the rear.
7. There is large window in the rear elevation of the neighbouring bungalow, but this is a sufficient distance from the extension and levels of light to that window would not be materially affected. I conclude therefore that the development would not be overly imposing, dominant or intrusive and that the living conditions currently enjoyed by the adjoining occupiers would not be materially affected.

Other Matters

8. I have considered the Parish Council's concern that the development would be out of keeping in the street scene. However, I agree with the District Council that the development would not adversely impact on the street scene due to the variety of dwelling types and styles. The Parish Council's further concern about the effects of the development on the adjoining occupier is addressed above.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials which is necessary to ensure the extension respects the design of the original house.
10. At present there is an attractive and well established hedge that forms the boundary between the two properties. The hedge would be very close to the extension and there is highly likely to be root damage during construction. Also, the hedge would adjoin the proposed patio doors to the dining room and there is likely to be pressure for pruning the hedge in future years. The hedge is an important landscape feature and it would soften the appearance of the extension when viewed from the neighbour's garden. I have therefore imposed a landscaping condition to require the hedge to be retained and replanted should it become damaged during construction.
11. I have not imposed the Council's suggested condition requiring the rooflight window to bedroom 1 to be obscurely glazed and fixed. During my site visit I considered the relationship of the window with the neighbouring properties. The angle of the roof slope is relatively steep and it may be possible to look out of the roof light towards the neighbouring property at No 45 Broadshard Lane. However, views would be restricted by the position of the extension relative to the neighbour's house, and by existing landscaping in the neighbour's garden. Consequently, I do not consider the condition to be necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not adversely affect the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. Consequently, it would accord with Policy CS2¹ of the Core Strategy which seeks to avoid unacceptable effects of new development including visual intrusion, overlooking and shading. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector

¹ New Forest District Council Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (adopted October 2009)