
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/17/3166381

Oak Cottage, Hightown Road, Hightown BH24 3DY

- 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 & Mrs West against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/11434, dated 18 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as to replace the existing side extension with a more in keeping two storey side extension, plus a rear double garage with accommodation over the top.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the countryside close to the built up area of Ringwood. There is a large field to the east and north of the site with a small area of scrub and field to the immediate west. The house is an attractive detached cottage style property of modest scale with a 'cat slide' roof to the rear, and it sits comfortably within its plot. There is a modern single storey flat roof extension on the west side of the house.
 4. The proposal would involve the replacement of the single storey extension with a two storey side extension including a garage with accommodation over. Policy DM20 of Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Development Plan (LPP2) permits residential development including extensions in the countryside provided certain criteria are met. The Council indicate that this is to maintain a balance in the District's rural housing stock, and to resist the cumulative effects of significant enlargements being made to rural dwellings. The policy allows for an increase in floorspace of 30%. Where an increase of more than 30% is proposed schemes may be permitted if the increased floorspace would not result in a dwelling in excess of 100 square metres. I accept that the proposal seeks to add only one main bedroom. Nevertheless, the scheme would result in an increase in floorspace of over 70% which would be significantly above the criteria.
-

5. I note that the materials would match that of the house and the extension would be set back from the front elevation. However, although the roof would be slightly lower than that of the house the extension would extend a significant distance beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The height and bulk of the extension would dominate the attractive 'cat slide' roof of the house, and the gable end of the extension would be the prevailing feature at the rear of the house. The extension would be seen as a prominent addition to the house from the road particularly when the trees and hedges are not in leaf. Overall, due to the scale and proportions of the extension it would appear as a disproportionate addition to the house.
6. I note that the single storey flat roof extension is slightly out of context with the design of the house. However, it is modest in scale and proportions, and does not impact significantly upon the attractive design of the main house. In terms of the detailed design of the proposal, I consider the Juliet balcony on the rear of the extension would not have a significant impact on the dwelling when considered on its own. However, these are not sufficient reasons to justify the appeal scheme.
7. The appellant has referred to the potential for large scale development on the land surrounding the appeal site. However, I note that the consideration of strategic sites is at an early stage; therefore I give this factor very little weight in the determination of this appeal. I acknowledge that Policy DM20 applies to a small number of properties in the area and it does not apply to the houses on the opposite side of the road. However, the house appears as an isolated property on the north of the road. It is clearly viewed in the context of being in the countryside, separate from the other houses.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and the existing dwelling. It would be in conflict with Policies CS2 and CS10 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park 2009 and Policy DM20 of LPP2. These amongst other things seek to safeguard the countryside from encroachment by built development, and new development being appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance. It would be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of the need for high quality design.
9. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised including the lack of objection from neighbours and other interested parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR