



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2020

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/19/3243080

20 West Park Lane, Damerham SP6 3HB

- 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 Ross Macildowie against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/10897, dated 26 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear first floor extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The above description of development is taken from the application form. However, I note that the proposal contains a number of elements including a first floor rear extension, front porch, bay window and side car port.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor rear extension on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to the location of the site within the Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies within a row of 4 pairs of semi-detached houses of similar style. The architectural harmony of this group is read from the street, but also from a public footpath crossing the field to the rear. From this vantage point, and notwithstanding the existence of a tree on the site boundary, it is possible to appreciate the distinctive catslide roofs characterising the group and the simplicity of building forms of the dwellings on this side of West Park Lane.
5. Openings within rear roof slopes are generally confined to roof lights and modestly sized dormers. This principle has been followed by recent extensions to No 40 and No 44 West Park Lane. During my visit I saw that No 18 has been the subject of a 'double layer' dormer extension. I do not know the full background to this development, or the local plan policies under which it may have been considered, but it clearly pre-dates publication of the National Planning Policy Framework which emphasises the need for good design. To my mind, that development illustrates the harm that can arise from poorly designed additions.

6. The proposed first floor extension would obscure the distinctive catslide roof and interrupt the uncomplicated form and massing of the property. It would constitute a bulky and discordant feature and would be out of character with the host building and other dwellings in the vicinity. Although visible in part from West Park Lane, the extension would be most prominent from the open countryside to the rear of the site. It would be seen in the context of existing built form and therefore its impact on the key characteristics of the AONB, as defined within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment, would be limited. Its design and scale would nonetheless fail to respect the character and appearance of the area, and the adverse impacts would not be adequately mitigated by the use of matching materials.
7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would conflict with Policy CS2 of the New Forest District (outside the National Park) Core Strategy (2009) and Policy DM20 of the New Forest District (outside the National Park) Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management (2014). For the reasons given above and having taken into account all other matters raised, including the Council's acceptance that the proposal would fall within the 30% size limit for domestic extensions set out within the supporting text to Policy DM20, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR