



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/20/3246618

43 Reed Drive, Marchwood SO40 4YF

- 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 Michael Lockey against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/11236, dated 28 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 43 Reed Drive, Marchwood SO40 4YF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/11236, dated 28 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan: Drawing No LOCK001.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is located amongst a 1980s housing estate. The properties are sited around the road system, with gardens and modest landscaped areas providing an established suburban character. The range of mainly two storey dwellings often have single storey garage and other projections attached to the main part of the buildings.
4. 43 Reed Drive has a fenced rear garden with a separate verge area to the side, which fronts Cranberry Close. This verge area is bounded from the road by a low hedge and a tree is located to the rear section. This reasonably wide verge space makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. However, the rather bland and unrelieved side elevation to the dwelling is quite a prominent

feature in parts of the street scene and this aspect of the property does not have the same variation or detailing as some other properties.

5. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling and also from the carriageway of Cranberry Close. The undeveloped space remaining to the front, side and rear of the extension would still retain an acceptable size of landscaped area that would continue to make a positive visual contribution in the context of the character of the estate and its original layout. The design of the extension would be broadly similar to other single storey additions within the estate. The ridge would approach the eaves line of the dwelling, however, the space around the extension, its single storey form and appearance, and the set back from the front of the building would ensure that it would appear as a subservient addition. The extension would not be overbearing nor would it cause visual harm to the site.
6. Furthermore, the proposal would add some variation to the side elevation of the dwelling in a way that would be in character with the form and appearance of other buildings within the wider estate.
7. I have taken into account the objections from the Parish Council, however, for the reasons explained above, the proposal would be an acceptable addition to this property and would not be out of keeping when viewed from Cranberry Close or the adjoining parts of Reed Drive.
8. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the extension would comply with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park (adopted 2009) and the National Planning Policy Framework which seek, notably, that development should be appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and its relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape features.

Conditions

9. The Council have recommended three conditions if I was minded to find the proposal acceptable. The statutory time limit is required and a condition specifying the approved plan is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring the extension to be built with matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR