



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: 7 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/19/3228195

Woodside, Lyndhurst Road, Landford, Salisbury SP5 2AF

- 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 Mike Kenward against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 19/00134, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two single-storey side extensions. Provision of detached timber garage, following demolition of brick garage and timber shed. Provision of air con unit and solar PV panels'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the supply of small dwellings and the host dwelling and curtilage.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest 2-bedroom detached bungalow which is located within a row of detached houses on the western side of Lyndhurst Road. Open countryside and mature trees are visible through the gaps to the sides of the buildings. The houses in the area are of varied size and design, and the buildings and landscape combine to create an area with a pleasing appearance.
4. Policy DP11 of the New Forest National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2010) (DPD) states that extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted provided that they are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage. The Policy also states that in the case of small dwellings, the extension must not result in a total habitable floorspace exceeding 100sqm. Supporting paragraph 7.36 states that proposals to extend dwellings can affect the locally distinctive character of the New Forest and increasing the size of dwellings has the potential to cause an imbalance in the range and mix of the housing stock available. Supporting paragraph 7.39 confirms for the purposes of applying Policy DP11 that "small dwelling" means "*a dwelling with a floor area of 80 sq. metres or less as it existed on 1 July 1982...*". Furthermore, the floorspace of

proposed extensions will include any habitable floorspace provided within a detached outbuilding.

5. The proposed single storey extension to the northern side of the dwelling would significantly increase the width and horizontal emphasis of the property. The extension would create a continuous wall on the front elevation which would appear bulky and out of proportion with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the extension would significantly reduce the gap that currently exists between the appeal property and Yew Tree Cottage which would erode views of the open countryside beyond. I acknowledge that there is currently tall vegetation along the front boundary which partially screens the dwelling from the street, however this is a natural feature that cannot be relied on in perpetuity to screen the development. As such, I find that the proposed single storey extension element of the proposal would fail to respect the modest scale of the existing dwelling.
6. There is no dispute between the parties that the existing dwelling is a "small dwelling" for the purposes of Policy DP11. However, there is disagreement about whether the development would result in a total habitable floorspace exceeding 100sqm. The Council has included the external recessed area to the rear of the proposed extension on the northern side of the dwelling as part of its floorspace calculation. However, Policy DP11 specifically refers to habitable floorspace, which does not include external space. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would not result in a total habitable floorspace exceeding 100sqm.
7. Nevertheless, whether or not the proposed development would result in a total habitable floorspace exceeding 100sqm is not the sole determining factor in relation to Policy DP11. It is a mechanism to help determine proposals, particularly in relation to the character of the National Park and the subsequent effect on housing stock. The first line of Policy DP11 states that extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted provided that they are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage. Supporting paragraph 7.38 states that the floorspace limitations set out in Policy DP11 are the maximum limit and although the extension may comply with the criterion, there could be another harmful impact which would make the proposal unacceptable. I find that the proposed single storey extension to the northern side of the dwelling would harm the host dwelling and its curtilage.
8. In relation to the proposed porch on the southern side of the dwelling, this would be set-back from the front wall and would be of modest height, width and depth. This element of the proposal would therefore appear as a proportionate addition to the host dwelling and its curtilage. Furthermore, the proposed solar photovoltaic cells and air conditioning system would not lead to any unacceptable harm to the host dwelling and its curtilage.
9. The proposed detached garage would replace the existing brick-built garage and timber shed, and would be positioned adjacent to the southern boundary. I observed a number of nearby large detached garages during my site visit, some of which are positioned forward of the houses. In this case, the proposed garage would not be positioned forward of the adjacent house at Englewood and so, in my judgement, it would not appear unduly prominent in the street scene. Furthermore, the garage would be used for purposes

incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and therefore it would not create a suburbanising effect. Moreover, the garage would be finished in timber cladding which would help it assimilate into the surroundings. As such, the garage would have limited impact on the character of the host dwelling and its curtilage.

10. Turning to the effect of the development on the balance of housing stock, although the proposed development would increase the amount of habitable floorspace, the dwelling would remain as a 2-bedroom property. There is no substantive evidence before me to show that the proposal would result in or contribute to a significant imbalance in the range and mix of the housing stock and therefore lead to an unacceptable effect on the supply of small dwellings. Furthermore, bearing in mind that there would be no increase in the number of bedrooms, I am not persuaded that the proposal would directly lead to any increase in the level of activity in the countryside or reduce the range of properties available in the National Park.
11. I find that the proposed porch, detached garage, solar photovoltaic cells and air conditioning system would not harm the host dwelling and curtilage; and that the proposed development as a whole would not harm the supply of small dwellings. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the host dwelling and its curtilage in respect of the extension to the northern side. In my assessment, I have had regard to the statutory purposes of the National Park designation and paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework to give great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park. As I have found harm within the proposal it is therefore contrary to Policy DP11 of the DPD, which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions to existing dwellings are appropriate to the dwelling and its curtilage.
12. I have had regard to the concerns raised by interested parties in relation to noise from the proposed air conditioning system, however the appeal is being dismissed for other reasons therefore I do not need to examine this particular matter further.

Conclusion

13. 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