
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/16/3157499

7 Gordon Road, Pennington, Lymington SO41 9JE

- 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 Mrs Faye Lawrence against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/10807, dated 9 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the alteration of cladding material from that previously approved.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side and rear extension, as amended, at 7 Gordon Road, Pennington, Lymington SO41 9JE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/10807, dated 9 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: 7GR/PP/02, P01, P02, S01 & S02.

Preliminary matters

2. There is already a planning permission in place for a side and rear extension to the property, and this application was solely to change the external materials from matching brick to timber cladding. The Council treated the application as for a single-storey side and rear extension, as amended. I shall do the same.

Main issue

3. This case centres on the visual impact of the change of cladding material so the main issue is the effect of that on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No.7 lies in a wide street lined by an eclectic range of properties. While most date from a similar era, I saw that many had been altered, some extensively, with a range of forms and materials. As acknowledged by the Council, flat-roofed single storey extensions are a feature of the road. I also note that the Lymington Local Distinctiveness SPD describes the alterations to built form in the vicinity as generally adding variety and charm. The narrow frontage of the extension reflects similar single storey extensions elsewhere in the street.
-

5. The contemporary design and form of the extension distinguishes it from the original house, clearly identifying it as a later addition. While I recognise that not everyone supports it, this is an established principle of good design. In my view the Council's requirement that the cladding should match the brickwork of the main house would disguise the modern origins of the extension and lead to a confusing disparity between the original 2-storey house and the single storey extension. I consider that the clarity of the relationship between old and new would be reinforced by the change to vertical timber cladding.
6. Given the range of additions and alterations in the road, this too would add to the variety and charm of the street scene. It would be a good response to prevailing local character, reflecting the varied identity of its surroundings. Accordingly I consider that the proposed change in cladding material would meet the requirement for good design set out in paragraphs 56-66 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It would be consistent with the Lymington Local Distinctiveness SPD and would comply with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.
7. I find that the change of cladding material from brick to timber would have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Colin Ball

Inspector