



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/19/3237620

22 Woodford Close, Ringwood, BH24 1UT

- 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 Kim and Ryan Bygrave against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/10518, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'two-storey side extension; rooflights'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description from the Council's decision notice as this succinctly and accurately describes the proposal in light of amendments made to the scheme at the planning application stage.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 22 Woodford Close is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a cul-de-sac of semi-detached, and detached houses, generally set-in from their side boundaries. I have noted some alterations and additions; however, a high degree of uniformity remains through materials, the spaces between properties and the symmetry of the semi-detached units. The street has a spacious and suburban character.
5. No 22 and the adjoining property have a high degree of symmetry presented to the street scene. The host building has retained an open driveway to the side leading up to a recessed garage. To the east, 20 Woodford Close has added a slim-framed, simple lean-to car port in front of its garage. As such, a high degree of separation and space is retained between the properties.
6. The proposal would extend the host building flush with the front elevation of the house at two-storey height up to the shared boundary with No 20. The proposal would have the same eaves and ridge as the host building. The cumulative effect of these alterations would be to both significantly unbalance

- the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and erode the space between Nos 20 and 22, leaving no space, on the appeal site, up to the shared boundary.
7. The appellant has highlighted a number of examples of additions to semi-detached houses that have affected the symmetry of the pair, and/or eroded the space between housing. However, I note that none of the examples exactly replicate the appeal site context or the appeal proposal. Furthermore, I consider that the examples are limited to a small proportion of the properties on the street as a whole. Therefore, the overall characteristics of symmetry and space between properties and shared boundaries remains a strong feature of the street scene. Taken in this context I find that the proposal would be harmful to the host building and the wider street scene of Woodford Close.
 8. I note that the proposal would retain a brick pier and utilise matching brick to the first-floor in order to define the original elevation. However, I do not consider that this mitigates the harm I have found. Furthermore, I accept the appellant may potentially carry out works to the side of their property under permitted development. However, I have seen nothing to suggest they would genuinely pursue this option if the appeal failed or that such a scheme would be similar to, or worse than, what is currently proposed. As such, it is a matter of negligible weight.
 9. Therefore, on the main issue I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy – New Forest District outside the National Park, adopted October 2009 and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek amongst other aims, to achieve high-quality design and contribute positively to local distinctiveness.
 10. Finally, the appellant has indicated that they would be willing to set the front elevation back and the ridge height down in order to have a favourable determination of the appeal. However, in the interests of fairness to all parties I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans considered by the Council. My decision does not prevent the appellant making alternative applications which shall be determined on their own merits.
 11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR