



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/19/3228741

15 Chichester Road, Poulner BH24 1UE

- 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 Benjamin Hume against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/10338, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a summerhouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed summerhouse on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms the right-hand half of a pair of semi-detached houses, which is located on a corner plot adjacent to the junction of Chichester Road and Frobisher Close. The surrounding area has a spacious feel due to the set-back of the houses from the road; the spacing of the houses; and the open grassed areas that are visible in the street scene. The side elevation of the appeal property, which includes the main entrance, is set back from Chichester Road and therefore contributes to the spacious feel of the area. The rear garden is on a higher land level to the highway in Chichester Road and is enclosed by a wall.
4. The proposed summerhouse would be sited in the rear garden and in close proximity to the boundary with Chichester Road. The land level of the garden is higher than the adjoining highway and so the summerhouse would rise noticeably above the garden wall in a prominent position. As such, taking into account the size of the summerhouse; its close proximity to the boundary with Chichester Road; and the difference in land levels between the garden and the highway, I find that the summerhouse would appear as a dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The appellant has referred me to examples of outbuildings at Nos 1 & 3 Chichester Road, which are positioned adjacent to boundary walls. However, the outbuildings are relatively small sheds which do not appear overly dominant in the street scene. The overall size of the summerhouse would be larger than the nearby examples and would appear more dominant in the street scene.
6. I note the appellant's comments that the summerhouse is a temporary structure which can be moved at any time and so Policy CS2 of the New Forest District Core Strategy (2009) should not be applicable. However, the proposed summerhouse is development and therefore Policy CS2, which requires development to be well-designed and respect local character, is relevant to the appeal. Furthermore, the appellant states that the summerhouse would provide a further screen to the garden and give the occupants a greater level of privacy, however, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Having regard to representations, I do not find that the proposed summerhouse would be likely to result in any additional noise arising over and above that which could already occur from the use of the site as a garden.
7. Accordingly, the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS2 of the New Forest District Core Strategy (2009), which seeks, amongst other things, well-designed development that respects local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp
INSPECTOR