



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/D/25/3368642

2 Fennel Gardens, Lymington SO41 9FS

- 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 Mark Nineham against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/10270.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the Fennel Gardens streetscene, and (ii) the effect of a shortfall in car parking.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is an end house in a terrace of four in Fennel Gardens, a cul-de-sac which forms part of a much larger residential development of relatively high density. In this end position and at the junction with Campion Way, No. 2 and more specifically the area of curtilage intended for the proposed development, are in a prominent position - especially in the northwards approach towards Spartina Drive.
4. The two-storey side extension would be slightly set down from the existing ridge and set back from the existing front wall in accordance with the standard guidance of such extensions. There would also be a small step-back towards the rear to maintain a separation from the flank boundary with the pavement of Campion Way and I note that this was an amendment requested by the Council.
5. Whilst the set down and set back from the existing dwelling are welcome features of the proposal, I agree with the Council that a proposed frontage width of 3.5m compared to the existing of 4.3m would appear as an overly dominant addition to the dwelling, rather than achieving the necessary subservience – the normal maximum often being half the width of the existing front elevation. And in this prominent position I have no doubt that the additional built form now proposed would erode the spacious character and appearance of this part of the overall residential area.

6. I acknowledge that there are other similar side extensions in the locality. However, the examples referred to do not in my view sufficiently reflect the individual circumstances and site-specific characteristics of the appeal dwelling and its garden to set a precedent for the proposal. Moreover, in this instance, I have little doubt that the comparatively wide plot at No. 2 was intended in the design of the original estate development, or if not, required by the Council to improve the quality of the layout and thereby the character and appearance of the area. If this was not the case, a terrace of five dwellings rather than four might reasonably been proposed and approved.
7. The grounds of appeal make the best possible case for a grant of permission, and I accept that the current scheme is an improvement on its predecessors. Nonetheless, with all things considered and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find on this issue that the side extension would have a harmful impact on the Fennel Gardens streetscene. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan 2016-2036 Part One: Planning Strategy for the New Forest outside of the National Park adopted in July 2020 and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
8. Turning briefly to the second issue of car parking, the Council's concern is that with the proposed increase from two to four bedrooms, its Adopted Parking Standards for residential development require three parking spaces within the curtilage of the appeal dwelling. This is a shortfall of one space, as two will be available on the driveway.
9. However, there is undesignated on-street parking opposite the dwelling in Campion Way and the appeal statement paints a rather more favourable picture of the site's location in relation to other travel modes and local shops and services. On this issue I therefore consider that it would be reasonable to take advantage of the flexibility suggested in Local Plan Policy CC2, as the deficiency of one space is unlikely to cause any noticeable effect or harm.
10. However, this does not outweigh my findings in favour of the Council's refusal on the first main issue and accordingly the appeal therefore fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR