



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/19/3232864

**Oak Trees, Road from Whitsbury Cross Towards Outwick, Whitsbury
SP6 3PU**

- 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 and Mrs Baines against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/10382, dated 25 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of detached outbuilding for storage of classic cars/logs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The site address in the banner heading is taken from the planning application form. The addresses given on the appeal form and the decision notice differ slightly from each other and the address above. For the avoidance of doubt, I use the address from the decision notice.
3. The description of development in the heading above is taken from the planning application form. The description on the appeal form matches that on the decision notice and is detached outbuilding. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the description from the appeal form and decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area including whether or not it would conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

5. Oak Trees is a detached chalet dwelling within a large, well-landscaped plot located in open countryside within the AONB. The surrounding area is characterised by woodland, interspersed with country lanes and woodland tracks, including a bridleway which runs adjacent to the eastern site boundary, and from which the site obtains vehicular access, and a lane which bounds the western boundary. There are a small number of scattered residential properties within clearings in the woodland, including two detached dwellings to the east

of the site and a single dwelling to the south. These are set within large, maturely landscaped plots. The predominant character of the area is that of tranquil woodland.

6. The appeal site includes a number of buildings in addition to the main dwelling, which appears to have been extended since originally built, particularly to its east side. The northern-most 'building' is large and incorporates four distinct pitched roof elements, including two garage/shed type structures. The main part, which includes a dormer window and internal staircase, appears to be used for additional living accommodation.
7. There is also a single storey, pitched roof, 4-vehicle, car barn with attached log store positioned beside the eastern boundary. Other structures within the site include a swimming pool with associated pool house and a detached shed.
8. The aforementioned buildings and structures are located approximately near the centre of the site where the outbuildings are closely related to the main dwelling and close to the site entrance and on-site parking area. The remainder of the garden to the north and south remains landscaped and undeveloped.
9. The proposal would result in a significant increase in built development within the appeal site in a manner that would not relate well to the main dwelling and its setting. It would extend the built form into the undeveloped northern part of the garden, taking up a large part of the garden, which at this point tapers noticeably, forming a triangle between the bridleway to the east, and the lane to the west, of the site.
10. The Appellant has confirmed that access would be via the existing site entrance. Accordingly, in addition to the proposed building, the car storage use is likely to result in the removal of some of the existing grass to provide suitable vehicular access to the building via the existing hard-surfaced area. The proposal would therefore consolidate and extend the existing built form further northwards into the site.
11. The combination of the length and width of the building and its position close to the side boundary and at the point where the garden width narrows, would result in a cramped development which would erode the spacious, landscaped character of the garden. The building width would be just over half that of the garden width at this point, and the building would extend for a length of about 17 metres within about 0.5 of a metre of the eastern side boundary. Notwithstanding the boundary fencing around the garden, the pitched roof of the new building would be visible in public views from outside the site. It would appear oppressive and dominant when viewed from the bridleway. I accept that the boundary fencing would partly screen the development from the bridleway. However, it would not fully screen the building from this viewpoint.
12. Given the size of the appeal building, it would not be subservient in scale when seen against the main chalet bungalow. Furthermore, the resulting number and size of outbuildings on the site would visually overwhelm, and detract from the otherwise spacious setting of, the main dwelling.
13. The encroachment into the soft landscaped garden and the resulting conglomeration of built development on the site would not respect the spacious and verdant rural character of the area, where properties are set within mainly undeveloped and landscaped surroundings. The proliferation of built

development would not be sensitive to the predominantly rural nature of the surrounding area and would not make a positive contribution to the aforementioned positive and distinctive characteristics of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and it would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.

14. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS2 and CS3 of the New Forest District outside the National Park Core Strategy 2009; policy DM20 of the New Forest District outside the National Park Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management 2014 (LP); policies 2 and 13 of the emerging New Forest District Local Plan 2016 – 2036 Part 1: Planning Strategy and paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively, these policies require new development to be well designed to respect the character of the countryside, to contribute positively to local distinctiveness and sense of place, to be appropriate and sympathetic to their setting in terms of scale, height, layout and relationship to adjoining buildings, and to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of AONBs.
15. The Council's refusal reason also refers to LP policy DM2. This policy relates to nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity. Therefore, I do not find it to be directly relevant to this main issue.

Other matters

16. I acknowledge the Appellants' wish for additional secure storage in connection with their classic car collection. I also note that the proposed materials would be appropriate to the rural location. However, these matters are not of sufficient magnitude to outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR