
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2020

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/20/3250950

15 Furzedale Park, Hythe, Hampshire SO45 3HU

- 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 Tom Bennett against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/11542, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 04 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is detached single storey garage 3m high to ridge 2.4m to eaves (monopitch).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The appellant's Design and Access Statement and the appeal form describe the development as also including a boundary fence. The Council's decision notice describes the development as 'detached single storey garage 3m high to ridge 2.4m to eaves (monopitch); boundary fence'. This is a clearer description of what is being proposed. I have accordingly dealt with the appeal on the basis of the description used by the Council in their decision notice.
3. At the time of my site visit, a monopitch double garage and boundary fencing had already been constructed on the appeal site. Whilst the application form states that the proposed garage would have brick walls to match the existing dwelling, the constructed garage on site has stained timber elevations. The constructed garage is also closer to the boundary of no 8 Pinewood Drive than is shown on the proposed plans. Given the design discrepancies between the existing garage and that shown on the proposed plans, I have not considered the proposal as a retrospective development.
4. During the course of the appeal the Local Plan 2016-2036 Part One: Planning Strategy (the Local Plan) was adopted by the Council. This partly replaced the New Forest District (outside the National Park) Core Strategy 2009, including Policy CS2 which was cited in the decision notice. The replacement policy, referred to as 'Policy 13' in the decision notice, but adopted as Policy ENV3, has similar policy requirements to the relevant part of Policy CS2. I have thus considered the appeal in relation to Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a corner plot located within an established residential area, adjoining Furzedale Park to the east and Pinewood Drive to the south. The surrounding residential area comprises a number of different styles of dwellings, including bungalows and 2-storey semi-detached houses. There is a common overall spacious character to the area. This character is derived from the set-back position of dwellings relative to the road and the limited extent of intervening hard boundary treatments and outbuildings. The set-back position of the dwellings on the 2 bends leading into the turning head of Pinewood Drive, including at 15 Furzedale Park, significantly contribute to the prevailing open character of the surrounding area.
7. On my site visit, I noted the recently constructed garage and fencing at no 15 appeared harmfully prominent, intrusive and discordant in the street scene. The appeal proposals, by virtue of their scale and prominent position forward of the front elevations of the dwellings on the northern side of Pinewood Drive, would appear similarly prominent, intrusive and discordant in the street scene. The proposal would result in a more built-up appearance at this corner location, harmfully eroding the identified open and spacious character of the area.
8. The proposal would, therefore, cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan and Policy D1 of the Hythe and Dibden Neighbourhood Plan which, taken together, require, amongst other things, development to achieve high quality design that responds to local character and context. Furthermore, the proposal fails to accord with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's concern that the Council has interpreted the original planning permission for the estate as providing a presumption against any development in between the houses and the road. I have, however, assessed the proposal on its own merits against current planning policy.
10. I understand the appellant's desire to use the space to the side of no 15 for a garage and to define the extent of the property with a fence. I also note the support of an interested party with regards to the perceived contribution the garage would make to reducing on-street parking. These factors do not, however, outweigh my findings on the main issue of character and appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR