



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 17 November 2020

by Mr Martin Allen B.Sc (Hons), M.Sc, M.R.T.P.I

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/20/3257610

20 Pegasus Avenue, Hordle, Lymington, SO41 0HN

- 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 & Ms P & T Golden & Munnik against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/10533, dated 14 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "Proposed roof alterations in association with first floor accommodation".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations in association with first floor accommodation at 20 Pegasus Avenue, Hordle, Lymington, SO41 0HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/10533, dated 14 May 2020, 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 following approved plans:
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development as stated on the application form. However, I have omitted reference to elements that are not development i.e. proposed, in the formal decision above.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a low-level, detached single storey property. The roof over is shallow pitched, with its ridge running parallel to the road. It forms one of a small group of similarly designed and proportioned dwellings at this location. Nonetheless, within the wider area there is more variety in the design of properties. I observed that a number of nearby dwellings had been altered, which has resulted in higher ridgelines to some roofs. Moreover, there were

larger properties, with steeper roof pitches in the wider area as well as those with ridgelines running perpendicular to the road. As a result, there was considerable variety in the buildings present in the area.

5. The proposed increase in height of the property would be readily apparent from the road. However, the shallow pitch and general form of the roof would be retained, as would the subservient projecting pitched roof to the front elevation. In this respect, the scheme would retain the characteristic attributes that the host property shares with its neighbours. Whilst I accept that the increase in the roof would introduce a distinction between them, given the variety that I have identified in the area, I consider that this would not be harmful. Furthermore, I find that the increase in the height of the dwelling would not be of such an extent so as to result in it being an overly dominant or incongruous feature within the streetscene.
6. I acknowledge that a previous scheme for the extension of the property was refused planning permission and that scheme was also dismissed at appeal. However, from the details I have been provided with, that scheme was substantially different from that which is before me, most notably as the previous scheme proposed the inclusion of hipped elements, the increase in pitch of the roof and the raising of an eaves level. As such, I do not consider the findings in that case justify dismissal of this appeal.
7. Accordingly, I find that the scheme would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with policy ENV3 of the New Forest District Local Plan – Part One: Planning Strategy (2020) insofar as it seeks to ensure that development is of high-quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness. I also find that the scheme would accord with GBE11 of the Hordle Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document, which advises that care should be taken to avoid forms of roof conversion which are unsympathetic. The scheme would not conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

8. In addition to ensuring adherence to the approved plans, a condition securing the use of matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and subject to the conditions as set out, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mr Martin Allen

INSPECTOR