



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2020

by **L McKay MA MRTPI**

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/20/3246930

Forest View, Pooks Green, Marchwood SO40 4WP

- 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 L Bundy against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/11373, dated 28 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is remodelling of detached dwelling including roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the Council made its decision it has adopted the Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning Strategy (LP), which now forms part of the development plan. The Council has confirmed that the policies referred to in its reasons for refusal have been replaced by LP Policies STR1 and ENV3. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on this change in policy circumstances.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in respect of privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is within a section of Pooks Green comprising bungalows and chalet bungalows set back from the road. While there is some variation in style and roof form, the dwellings are broadly consistent in height. Large front gardens, low front boundary treatments and wide verges give this section of the road a spacious character. This contrasts markedly with the more enclosed character of the northern section of Pooks Green, and other surrounding roads, which comprise mainly 2-storey dwellings with taller boundary fences and hedges. Consequently, the area immediately around the appeal site has a distinctive character, which is shared by the appeal property.
5. Due to the proposed height, depth and roof form, the proposals would make the appeal property significantly taller and bulkier than the bungalows either side. The design attempts to reduce the massing of the proposed extensions through different roof forms and eaves levels. However, the use of a low eaves at the front would highlight the height and scale of the front gable, which would be substantially taller and wider than other such features in the area. The

two-storey section of the proposed extensions would be set back into the site, however it would be easily appreciated from the road as the front wall immediately behind the gable would be two storeys high. The double roof arrangement would also be visible above the neighbouring property Bryher.

6. The contemporary design proposed would reference features such as large windows and front gables that are found on several other properties nearby. Render is also commonly used in the local area and therefore, in principle, this material would not be out of place in the street scene. However, the expanse of white render proposed would be visible above the roofs of neighbouring properties, and as such would emphasise the greater height and bulk of the proposed extended dwelling relative to its neighbours.
7. Consequently, although it would respect the spacing between dwellings in this area, the proposed extended dwelling would be overscaled in relation to the properties around it. As a result, it would be a dominant and prominent feature in the street scene, which would detract from the distinctive character of this part of Pooks Green and would not be sympathetic to its context. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would therefore conflict with LP Policies STR1 and ENV3, which seek to achieve high quality design that contributes positively to local distinctiveness.
8. Local and national policies require high quality design that respects local character even outside of designated areas, which, for the reasons set out above, this proposal would not achieve. While the appellant suggests that substantial remodelling is to be expected on this type of large plot, I have not been made aware of any other schemes built or permitted in this immediate area. The potential for other developments to come forward in the future does not therefore justify the harm that would result from the proposal before me, which I have considered on its own merits.

Living conditions

9. The proposed rear balcony would provide views from an elevated position towards the rear gardens of both neighbouring properties. The existing garage of Bryher would screen views towards the seating area at the rear of that dwelling, and as such there would not be any significant adverse impact on the privacy of the occupiers.
10. Although parts of the garden of Arnwood are currently overlooked by neighbouring windows, due to its size the proposed balcony would result in significant additional overlooking and consequent loss of privacy to that property, to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers. This could however be mitigated by a taller screen along the relevant side of the proposed balcony, which could be secured by a planning condition.
11. Therefore, the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in respect of privacy. Accordingly, I find no conflict with LP Policy ENV3 insofar as it requires development to avoid unacceptable effects on residential amenity by reason of overlooking.
12. The lack of harm in this respect would not however outweigh the harm that I have found in relation to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR