



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2020

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/20/3248789

Willows, Brook Hill, Norleywood, Lymington, SO41 5RQ

- 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 Mrs Hartshorn against the decision of the New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 19/00823, dated 23 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension to facilitate additional habitable accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. An unaccompanied site visit for the appeal was initially considered to be appropriate. However, once on site it was evident to me that it was not possible to suitably judge the effect of the scheme on the neighbouring property Foxgloves from outside the appeal site along Brook Hill. I subsequently requested access into the garden of the appeal property from the appellants who were in at the time. Access was granted and I proceeded to undertake the site visit unaccompanied within the appeal site. For the avoidance of any doubt, there was no discussion with regard to the merits of the case.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Forest South East Conservation Area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located at the top of Brook Hill in the hamlet of Norleywood and accommodates a detached bungalow. The appeal site falls within the Forest South East Conservation Area (the CA). I am mindful of my general duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA (Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)).

5. The scheme would result in the construction of a first-floor extension to provide living accommodation within the roof space of the bungalow. This would be done by raising the ridge height of the existing property by approximately 2 metres. There would also be a fully hipped roof form with gablets. I consider that the combination of the proposed 6 metre ridge height and the low eaves would result in a 'top heavy' appearance to the host dwelling. This along with the proposed relatively blank roofscape on the front elevation would create a bulky and awkward addition to the host dwelling that would cause harm to its character and appearance.
6. Despite the variation in dwelling types and architectural styles in the surrounding area, the hipped roof form with gablets would also appear contrived and out of place. I acknowledge similar structures, with gablets exist at Carters Farm, Norleywood, but these are set within an agricultural context and are located some 275 metres away from the appeal site.
7. Despite the existing vegetation along Brook Hill, the proposal would be evident from the street scene when within the vicinity of the site and would be evident from the surrounding dwellings. Whilst I do not consider the scheme would be overly dominant in the street scene due to its set back from the road, fall in levels and the large willow tree in front of the house, the bulky appearance and awkward design would nonetheless be evident and would cause harm to character and appearance of the CA.
8. I acknowledge that the pitch of the roof would be 35 degrees throughout, and this would be similar to some surrounding dwellings. I also accept that the hipped roof form with gablets was utilised to respond to the close relationship with neighbouring properties, including Foxgloves to the north. However, these matters do not overcome or outweigh my above concerns.
9. For all of these reasons, I conclude that the scheme would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Given the modest nature of the scheme, the harm caused to the CA, as a whole, would be less than substantial and therefore the public benefits of the scheme need to be weighed against the harm. The appellants would benefit from enhanced living conditions and there would be a reduction of carbon use through improved insulation and renewable energy provision. However, I consider that these matters are not sufficient either individually or in combination to outweigh the identified harm to the CA.
10. The scheme therefore conflicts with Policies DP2, SP7, SP16, SP17, DP18 and DP36 of the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 - 2036 (August 2019), the Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the Boldre Village Design Statement SPD, the National Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

11. The occupants of the neighbouring property Foxgloves have raised concerns with regard to the impact of the scheme on their outlook, privacy and the potential for loss of light. However, I am mindful that the footprint of the existing building would not be altered, and the design of the proposal ensures the bulk of the proposed roof is set away from Foxgloves. This along with the 10 metre separation, would ensure that there would be no unacceptable loss of outlook or loss of daylight or sunlight. In addition, the proposed first floor

window within the north elevation would be set at a high level and therefore there would be no loss of privacy. I therefore agree with the Council that the scheme would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of Foxgloves.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations that individually or in combination outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR