
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by **C J Ball** DArch DCons RIBA IHBC

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

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/16/3158412

6 Ellery Grove, Lymington SO41 9DX

- 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 P Wade against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/10815, dated 10 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the alteration and extension of existing dwelling including raising roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alteration and extension of the existing dwelling including raising the roof at 6 Ellery Grove, Lymington SO41 9DX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/10815, dated 10 June 2016, 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 plans: TBD/16/1040/01 Rev O and TBD/16/1040/03 Rev O.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the Japanese Cedar (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme for the protection of the tree shall be carried out as approved.
-

Preliminary matters

2. While the Council changed the description of the proposal, itemising its constituent parts, I consider the application description to be sufficient and accurate and I proceed on that basis.
3. I note that an application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement by 4 dwellings on the site was dismissed on appeal in 2012. I have taken account of my colleague's findings.

Main issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

5. The property is a small bungalow lying within a loose grouping of 4 similar dwellings below, and to the east of, the imposing 3-storey Buckland Court. Further east on Ellery Grove the dwellings are predominantly of 2 storeys. While this small group has a separate low-key character, partly as a result of their larger gardens, all 4 dwellings differ somewhat in form and appearance and none of them has any real architectural merit or makes any notable contribution to the quality of the street scene. I note that a similar proposal at one of the group, No.10, was granted planning permission in 2003, although this has not been implemented.
6. The main alteration here would be the creation of first floor accommodation beneath a simple pitched roof with pairs of dormer windows front and rear. The overall increase in ridge height would be some 2.2 metres. The additional wall height would be clad in weatherboarding.
7. The Council relies heavily on the findings of the previous appeal. However, that proposal was for a row of 4 semi-detached 2-storey dwellings, 5 m closer to the road, extending close to the side boundaries and of noticeably greater height, width, depth and mass than the existing building. They would have represented a significant increase in the amount of built form on the site, resulting in a cramped appearance, at odds with the more spacious feel of the surroundings.
8. This proposal involves works to the existing house so there would be no encroachment forward or sideways, no real increase in plan size (although the roof would be higher), a limited increase in built form and the quality of the spacious surroundings would be maintained. While the eaves would be perhaps 1.5 metres higher, I do not consider that the enlarged building, set back on lower ground, would in any way dominate the street scene. While it would differ from its neighbours, there is nothing harmful in that given the lack of replicable quality features and the existing differences between them.
9. The Council considers that the weatherboard cladding would not reflect local materials, and that this would contribute to a dominant appearance. I am not convinced of the harm in this but I saw no other instances of weatherboard cladding locally. It would be appropriate, as the appellant suggests, for this matter to be reconsidered through the imposition of a suitable condition.

10. There is also a Japanese Cedar on the site subject to a TPO. It will be necessary to protect the tree from the potential for damage during construction so I shall add an appropriate condition.
11. On that basis I find that the altered building would respect the identity of the area and would not be out of place in the street scene. Accordingly I consider that the proposed alterations would meet the requirement for good design set out in paragraphs 56-66 of the National Planning Policy Framework and would comply with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.
12. I find that the proposed alterations and extensions would have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Colin Ball

Inspector