



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/25/3361132

18 Daniells Walk, Lymington, Hampshire SO41 3PN

- 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 Mr and Mrs Pennock against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/11128.
 - The proposed development is described as 'Detached outbuilding (garage)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant's name was initially set out in the application form in the manner set out in the banner heading above. The subsequent appeal form has referred to Mr Roger Pennock as being the appellant. Following the appellant's clarification, I am satisfied that it should proceed in the terms set out in the banner.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of a detached dwelling with a half-hipped roof, located in a residential area characterised by properties of varying scales and styles. The properties are typically set back within their plots, with parking areas and garages to the front. Some plots contain mature trees in their front garden, while the other, like the appeal site, are surrounded by hedges and shrubs along their front boundary. The pattern of the development generally follows the natural bend of the road and creates a gently staggered street scene that positively contributes to the character of the area. Despite the variety of building designs and scales, the overall spaciousness creates a consistent and cohesive character in this area and that makes a significant contribution to its local distinctiveness.
5. With regard to the appeal proposal, the design and external materials of the proposed garage would generally reflect the character of the host dwelling. However, it would not be modest in scale. It would also be sited close to the road, projecting noticeably forward of the neighbouring garages, thereby disrupting the established pattern of development of the area. Whilst I appreciate that there would be some hedges along the front boundary, the upper elements of the

structure would remain clearly visible in the street scene. Consequently, it would create an incongruous feature that undermine the cohesive and established character of the area.

6. The appellant suggests that the hedges could be maintained to a certain height to obscure the view to the proposed garage, I am however not convinced that this would fully address my concerns as they are a more fundamental nature.
7. A number of examples of existing garages, which are in Daniells Walk and Church Lane, with proximity to a highway have been drawn to my attention. Whilst I do not have full details on each case, nor the circumstances under which they were constructed, none are directly comparable to the appeal proposal. It is because that they are considerably set back from the road, some of them are of a different design or orientation, and others are not seen in the same context. Although some of them appear to be larger than the appeal proposal, they sit more comfortably with their host dwelling and the surrounding areas.
8. Overall, I conclude the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not comply with Policy ENV3 of the New Forest District Local Plan Part 1: Planning Strategy 2020. The policy seeks that the development to achieve high quality design which promotes local distinctiveness, respects and enhances the existing character of the area.

Other Matter

9. I note that the Lymington and Pennington Town Council did not raise objections to the proposal. However, the lack of objections does not equate to a lack of harm. Whilst I note the location of the proposal is constrained by drains crossing the site and the location of neighbouring properties, this does not alter my conclusions on the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

O Tresa

INSPECTOR