
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/16/3157516

11 Dudley Avenue, Hordle, Lymington SO41 0HY

- 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 M Bennett against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/10449, dated 1 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The works proposed are far more extensive than a simple loft conversion. The Council refers to the proposal as roof alterations, dormers and roof lights in association with new first floor, fenestration alterations. I consider that to be a more accurate description of the proposed works.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. The property is a mid-20th century bungalow, recently extended, in a street of similar dwellings. It has essentially a simple square plan form with a symmetrical steeply pitched hipped roof. A sizeable single storey pitched and flat roofed extension has been added to the rear, providing a conservatory and a bedroom wing, which extends beyond the side of the bungalow. I saw that many of the other bungalows in the street have been altered, some extensively including first floor accommodation, so there can be no real objection in principle to further alterations at this property.
 5. A striking characteristic of the street scene is the predominance of pitched roofs and the particular interest of the group inter-relationship of these roofs along the street, contributing to a strong sense of place. I saw that even the more extensive alterations have been designed using primarily traditional roof forms, reflecting the distinctive identity of the street.
 6. This proposal would create new first floor accommodation over virtually the whole of the existing ground floor plan area, with just the roof over the ground floor bedroom wing being retained as loft storage. The design approach here to such a monolithic addition is to cover it with a large area of flat roof. In
-

design terms, this is a weak and over-simplistic approach to the problem of roofing a large area. In an attempt to conceal the extent of the flat roof, the front roof slope would be replaced by a hipped gable slope, there would be short pitched parapet sides and, at the rear, a confused arrangement of pitched slopes to accommodate a 2-storey height conservatory, resulting in ill-thought-out roof junctions.

7. Despite the ill-advised attempts to disguise it, the disproportionate bulk and flat-roofed form of the first floor accommodation would be clearly apparent from the street. The poorly considered design would be conspicuously out of place in a street strongly characterised by pitched roofs. This would be a poor design, failing to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of the area. It shows little response to local character and reflects nothing of the strong identity of its surroundings. It would not meet the requirement for good design set out in paragraphs 56-66 of the National Planning Policy Framework and would not comply with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.
8. I therefore consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Colin Ball

Inspector