

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2017

by Ray Wright BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/17/3167446

Little Oaks, 9 Gannet Close, Hythe SO45 3GH

- 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 Monger against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/11277 was refused by notice dated 21 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 'new first floor roof extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow at the end of a cul-de-sac of similar detached single storey dwellings. It has a low ridge roof, and double gable frontage. The proposal is to add first floor accommodation consisting of two bedrooms, one en-suite.
 4. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) indicates there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, but confirms good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that development of poor design, which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should be refused.
 5. Policy CS2 of the New Forest District Council Core Strategy – 'New Forest outside the National Park' 2009 (CS) similarly requires new development to be well designed and to respect the character of the area, being sympathetic to its setting amongst other matters in terms of scale and height.
 6. While the wider area has a mix of dwelling forms and styles, the houses in this part of the road are single storey bungalows. Although extensions and alterations appear to have taken place none appear to have provided roof accommodation. The appeal property, due to its size and design, currently has a low key presence at the end of this cul-de-sac and relates well to nearby dwellings which all appear to date from a similar period.
-

7. The form and scale of the property would be considerably altered by the appeal proposal due to the amount of floor space proposed at first floor level. To achieve the required headroom a complete reconfiguration of the roof is required and the overall ridge height would be raised by around 2.7 metres. The resultant bulk and mass at first floor level would be significant.
8. This high ridge line would rise above that of the adjoining properties and, due to the form and volume of the proposed first floor, represent a conspicuous feature. The new large expanse of roof on the south west side of building would be clearly visible from the public realm, within the cul-de-sac, and be a particularly jarring feature out of keeping with the adjoining bungalows. The impact would not be substantially reduced by the proposed half hip ends and would make this property a dominant building at the end of the road.
9. The proposed front elevation with its gable form, would, due to its height and proportions, represent a far more prominent feature than the current low double gable frontage and would be uncharacteristic of the simple architectural style of the existing bungalows in the road.
10. To my mind, the adverse visual effects of the development would not be compensated for, or significantly diminished, by the slight gradient in the road or by the position of the dwelling adjoining a wooded area at the end of the cul-de-sac.
11. While I note the Council's concern that this development could set a precedent for other development, I have considered this scheme on its individual merits based on the specific design put forward.
12. I recognise the family circumstances, put forward by the appellants, but these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified in this particular scheme.
13. Due to the scope of the alterations and their overall scale, the proposed development would not suitably relate to its immediate surroundings and would be incongruous and out of place with other properties in the road. Overall, I conclude the development proposed would harm the character and appearance of this cul-de-sac and, as such, is contrary to the Framework, and Policy CS2 of the CS.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ray Wright

INSPECTOR