

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2024

by R Cahalane BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/24/3347079

99 Hightown Road, Ringwood, Hampshire BH24 1NL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Jensen and Mr Hall against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/10113.
 - The development proposed was described as: "Two storey rear extension; addition of dormer windows to front elevation; demolition of garage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey rear extension; loft conversion with addition of dormer windows to front elevation; fenestration alterations and roof lights, single-storey porch to front elevation and demolition of garage at 99 Hightown Road, Ringwood, Hampshire BH24 1NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/10113, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the decision notice differs to that contained within the application form and which is also included in the banner heading. I have determined the appeal on the basis of this amended description, as it provides some additional detail that reflects the proposed development as shown in the submitted plans.
3. A planning application was also submitted to seek to sever the existing rear garden of the appeal site (No. 99 Hightown Road) and construct a single storey bungalow. As this proposal was refused by the Local Planning Authority (LPA, ref: 24/10112) on 29 April 2024, and involves a different type of development to the current appeal scheme, it has had no bearing in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and,

- the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 89 Parsonage Barn Lane and 97 Hightown Road, with particular regard to privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. No. 99 Hightown Road comprises a detached single storey bungalow facing the highway, near its junction with Parsonage Barn Lane and within a residential area of Ringwood. Surrounding dwellings comprise a mixture of two storey dwellings and bungalows, some of which contain first floor dormer windows. No. 99 is of similar height and roof form as No. 97 Hightown Road alongside it and immediately to the other side, 101 Hightown Road contains a higher roof form with a front dormer and side gable ends.
6. The appeal proposal would include a slight roof height increase and a more noticeable footprint and massing increase, arising from a two-storey flat roof form contained within a dual pitch roof with rear gable ends. The resultant roof form would depart from the existing traditional pitched roof form of No. 99, but would be of similar overall height to the ridge line of No. 101.
7. During my site visit, I noted that No. 101 contains a two-storey rear mansard-style extension, which includes a flat roof, rear gable end and side dormer. Whilst I do not have the planning history or policy context of this example before me, this extension is of similar depth to that proposed, while also taking various design cues from No.101, and is readily visible along Hightown Road and from Parsonage Barn Lane.
8. The appeal scheme would be closer to Parsonage Barn Lane than No. 101 and would be slightly higher and bulkier. It would nonetheless sit and be read comfortably alongside the existing flat roof form of No. 101. The overall increased height and scale would form an appropriate transition between the bungalow of No. 97 and the higher and extended dwelling of No. 101. Given this context, the appeal proposal would not appear unduly squat, discordant or out of keeping in its setting. The proposed first floor front dormer windows would be proportionate to the roof slope they would sit in and the fenestration below, and would not appear out of keeping in the context of the nearby front dormers along Hightown Road and Parsonage Barn Lane.
9. The LPA's officer report does not cite any harm in respect of the proposed front porch and other alterations to No. 99. The porch would be of modest and traditional canopy form and would complete the overall symmetrical front elevation of No. 99. The rooflights and overall fenestration alterations are also acceptable having regard to the surrounding mix of dwelling styles.
10. The proposed development would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with the relevant provisions of Policy ENV3 of the District's Local Plan Part 1 (LDPP1) which requires, amongst other things, development to be of high quality design and sympathetic to its context in terms of scale, height and appearance. I also find no conflict with the policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seek to achieve developments that are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

11. The proposed extension would include two first floor rear elevation windows serving bedrooms. No. 89 Parsonage Barn Lane contains habitable windows at first floor level that are close to the rear garden side boundary of No. 99 Hightown Road. No. 89 does not directly face the rear elevation of No. 99 and is sited along the rearmost part of No. 99's rectangular rear garden, beyond its existing patio area and outbuildings. The resultant proximity between these neighbouring windows would not feel uncomfortably close. Views would be sufficiently oblique and of sufficient separation distance to avoid an adverse degree of overlooking and visual intrusion.
12. No. 97 Hightown Road is sited immediately alongside No. 99 and contains a north facing rear elevation window serving a ground floor habitable room. This neighbour also contains a projecting outshot beyond the other side of this window, and a rear outbuilding opposite it. The existing single storey rear outshot of No. 99 already projects slightly beyond this neighbouring window. I also noted trellis and shrubbery above the existing closeboard fence forming the rear garden side boundary between these neighbours.
13. The appeal proposal would be considerably higher than No. 99's existing rear outshot and would remain close to the side boundary with No. 97, although the additional depth beyond the outshot would be more limited. The abovementioned existing features already form a significant degree of enclosure to this window and the courtyard space immediately beyond it. The overall degree of increased height, depth and built form would therefore not lead to an adverse additional level of visual intrusion or overbearing impact upon No. 97.
14. The orientation means that the additional loss of sunlight to and overshadowing of No. 97 would only occur during early morning periods. At other times, sunlight to the affected window would already be restricted by existing built layouts, and the window would still receive some evening sunlight. The overall courtyard/garden space of No. 97 would also still receive some sunlight throughout afternoon and evening periods. The extent of projection beyond No. 97's rear elevation would still allow for sufficient daylight to be received. The additional loss of daylight and sunlight, and overshadowing, would therefore not be adverse.
15. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of 89 Parsonage Barn Lane and 97 Hightown Road in terms of privacy, outlook, and daylight and sunlight. Consequently, no conflict arises with the relevant provisions of Policy ENV3 of the LDPP1 insofar as it requires, amongst other things, new development to avoid unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion or overbearing impact, overlooking, shading, or other adverse impacts.

Conditions

16. The LPA has suggested two conditions in the event that the appeal is allowed. I agree that conditions specifying time limits for the development (condition 1) and the approved plans (condition 2) are necessary in the interests of planning certainty. The submitted plans do not indicate the precise external brick, dormer cladding and front porch material specifications. As such, in the

interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, I consider it necessary and reasonable to impose a further pre-commencement planning condition (condition 3) to ensure that the specification details of all the proposed external materials are submitted to the LPA for its consideration.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

R Cahalane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby approved relates to the following list of approved plans: DAK/HR/01 Location Plan; DAK/HR/03 Block Plan; DAK/HR/06 Proposed Floor Plans; DAK/HR/07 Proposed Elevations; DAK/HR/09 Proposed Roof Plan; DAK/HR/11 Proposed Section.
- 3) No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

End of Schedule