



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2019

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/19/3234599

20 Pegasus Avenue, Hordle, Hampshire SO41 0HN

- 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 Ms P and T Golden and Munnik against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/10370, dated 20 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations in association with first floor accommodation and new front boundary wall (to replace existing).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form and is similar to the description on the decision notice and appeal form which is roof alterations in association with new first floor; front boundary wall. The appellants' statement of case confirms that, having regard to the Council's refusal reasons, the appellants no longer intend to pursue the replacement front boundary wall, the details of which are included on planning application drawing PA01. Accordingly, the appellants have advised that they wish the appeal to be limited to the consideration of the proposed roof alterations only.
3. The appellants have not submitted a revised plan to replace drawing PA01. The planning appeals procedural guidance¹ (Annexe M) advises that, if an applicant thinks that amending their application proposals will overcome the local planning authority's reasons for refusal, they should normally make a fresh planning application. Moreover, if an appeal is made, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the scheme which was refused by the council and the plans listed on the decision notice, which include drawing PA01.

¹ Procedural Guide. Planning Appeals – England. The Planning Inspectorate August 2019.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a low level, detached bungalow with a shallow pitched roof and is sited on the southeast side of Pegasus Avenue. It is a typical example of the detached single storey dwellings characteristic of the original development of the road and neighbouring roads. Many of the original bungalows have been altered or extended, and chalet-style dwellings are evident within the surrounding area. Notwithstanding this, the appeal property sits within a group of similarly low height bungalows with a simple pitched roof design, on the southeast side of the street. Viewed collectively, they form a distinct group when viewed from the street, and their moderate height is viewed within a backdrop of mature trees to the rear.
6. Although the appeal property has been extended to the front and rear, resulting in a significant increase in building footprint, the scale and height of the roofs of the extensions are subsidiary to the main roof, eaves levels match those of the original roof, and the gabled elements are subservient in size to the principal roof. Accordingly, although the extensions were added at different times, the simple, low level, pitched roof, design integrity of the original dwelling has been maintained, and the appeal property sits comfortably in relation to the group of bungalows within which it is sited, and does not appear visually incongruous within the street scene.
7. The appeal proposal would significantly extend the volume of the roof to provide three bedrooms, a bathroom and ensuite facilities in a new first floor level of accommodation. The existing simple, low-level, pitched roof would be replaced by a higher, cropped gable ended main roof incorporating three dormers on the rear and a new hipped roof projection at the front. The proposal would therefore introduce a significantly different roof form to that of the simple, low-level pitched roof form characteristic of the part of the road within which the appeal site is located.
8. The proposed bulk, height, mass and design of the roof of the appeal proposal would be at odds with the simple, low-level, pitched roof, regular roof form of the aforementioned group of properties within which the appeal property is viewed from the public realm. The increased height, mass, and bulk of the main roof would be over-dominant in relation to the roofs of the neighbouring properties. The existing simple subservient front gabled roof element, a characteristic of a number of properties within the road, would be replaced by a significantly larger, hipped roof, front roof element, with an eaves to ridge height which would be double that of the existing front gable projection, a wide span, and a hipped roof form would be out of keeping with the gable front features characteristic of the street.
9. The proposed deep roof, with wide span cropped gable ended side elements, and a hipped roof front projection, would introduce an incongruous roof design within an area where gable ended pitched roofs are the predominant roof form. The higher eaves level of the proposed front hip in relation to the main roof and the lower hipped roof element adjacent to it, would add further inconsistency to the scheme. This would exacerbate its unsympathetic

appearance within the street scene and its poor relationship to neighbouring properties where front roof elements are subsidiary to, and have a similar eaves height to the main roof. The resulting building would appear over-dominant within the street scene and incongruous and visually discordant in relation to the aforementioned harmonious pattern of development in this part of the street.

10. I have taken into consideration the roof extensions that have been carried out at No.11, opposite the appeal site, which were allowed on appeal in December 2006. The proposed development would result in a higher ridge height than that of No.11. Whilst comprising a higher and altered roof form in comparison with its neighbouring properties, the development at No.11 is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. It comprises a simple pitched roof form with subsidiary front projecting gable element of matching eaves height, which is characteristic of the road. The front dormer sits subserviently within the front roof slope. The roof form has remained simple, and the front elements do not overwhelm the main roof. As a result, it does not appear unduly incongruous in relation to the neighbouring development or as a discordant element within the street scene.
11. I have had regard to the extended properties at the western and eastern ends of the southeast side of Pegasus Avenue. Notwithstanding the date when permission was granted for the alterations to Nos. 6 and 28, in relation to Nos. 4 and 30, I must determine this appeal on the basis of its impact on the current street scene character. The context of these extensions within the street scene is different to that of the appeal site, given their transition location where there is a merging into the neighbouring roads. Notwithstanding this, they do, nevertheless, retain a pitched roof form, unlike the appeal proposal.
12. A dwarf brick wall defines the front boundary of the appeal site. This form of front boundary treatment is characteristic of the original street development and has been largely retained within the street. Where present, higher piers are usually only featured at the ends of the walls. The combination of low brick walls, often with soft landscaping behind, together with grass verges on the footpaths, serve to give the street scene an open, spacious and green character. The low front walls therefore make a positive contribution to the visual amenities of the townscape, so that built development does not dominate the edge of the street. The proposed replacement of the existing frontage wall with a brick wall of at least twice its height, and incorporating a number of higher brick pier elements, would be out of keeping with the characteristic dwarf front boundary walls, and would be unduly visually dominant within the street scene. It would extend across the site frontage, with the exception of the vehicular access, thereby eroding the open, spacious character of the site frontage to the detriment of the street scene.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CS2 of the New Forest District outside the National Park Core Strategy 2009 (CS), and guidance GBE11 and RBE05 of the Hordle Village Design Statement SPD 2014 (SPD), which, amongst other things, require new development to be well designed, contribute positively to local distinctiveness and sense of place, and be appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, appearance and relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape features. For similar reasons, the proposal would also

be contrary to Policies of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) which seek to secure high quality design as set out in Chapter 12.

Other Matters

14. Whilst I have given careful consideration to the appellants' desire to provide additional bedroom accommodation for their growing family, and to rationalise the internal layout of the appeal property, I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance² that, in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is also probable that the proposed development would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material. For these reasons, I therefore find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused contrary to the CS, the SPD and the Framework.

Conclusion

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

S Leonard

INSPECTOR

² Paragraph 008 Reference ID 21b-008-20140306 – 'What is a material planning consideration?'