

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

**by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 23 January 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/16/3154841**

**20 Ash Grove, Ashurst, Hampshire S040 7BN**

- 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 and Mrs Payne against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref 16/00185, dated 3 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2016
  - The development proposed was originally described as "3m rear extension, reposition of kitchen area, new dining area and ground floor bathroom. Improved design of existing front dormer, new side elevation, dormer in association with roof alteration works for two new first floor bedrooms and new family bathroom. Demolishment of existing garage and rebuild with new garage with hipped roof."
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a "3m rear extension, reposition of kitchen area, new dining area and ground floor bathroom. Improved design of existing front dormer, new side elevation, dormer in association with roof alteration works for two new first floor bedrooms and new family bathroom. Demolishment of existing garage and rebuild with new garage with hipped roof" at 20 Ash Grove, Ashurst, Southampton S040 7BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00185, dated 3 March 2016, 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 plan: 101: 103.
  3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

## Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the area and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 18 Ash Grove, having regard to outlook and privacy.
-

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal site comprises a bungalow with a front and rear dormer which has been added after the dwelling was built. Ash Grove comprises bungalows of similar sizes, ages and architectural styles. A few properties have been extended, including with dormers but in the main, the dwellings retain their original form.
4. The proposal would result in little visual change to the front elevation because the frontage façade would remain the same. Although the new side dormer would be visible, most of it would be mainly hidden by the roof of a side bay and chimney, and would be positioned to the rear of the extended dwelling. Down the sides of the dwelling, there would be an increase in building depth by reason of the additional extension to the rear. However, the extension would continue the pitched roof form of the existing dwelling and its depth would be considerably shorter than the existing dwelling. The ridge of the extended roof would also be slightly lower than the original roof ridge. As to the side dormer, this would be modestly proportioned approximately matching the size of the existing front dormer.
5. To the rear, there would be a partially hipped gable which results in the disappearance of the fully hipped pitched roof. The gable feature would not be an original characteristic of the host or neighbouring dwellings. However, it would replace an awkward proportioned dormer by reason of its depth and height. Overall, the rear part of the elevation would be a visual improvement for this reason.
6. There is some dispute over the size increase of the dwelling and whether the extensions would be subservient. However, the submitted plans show a rear extension depth smaller than that of the existing dwelling and a first floor largely contained within a reformed roof. Therefore, the increased bulk of the extended dwelling would not be visually intrusive for these reasons despite the changes to the roof form. Consequently, the proposal would also comply with the New Forest Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2010 because the extension would be compatible with the main building avoiding significant impact on the scale of the core or original element.
7. In relation to neighbouring dwellings, the extended dwelling would not be out of scale by reason of the main extended part of the development being positioned behind the front façade. Additionally, neighbouring dwellings would be positioned a significant distance away from the extended dwelling.
8. In conclusion, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District Council outside the National Park (CS) 2009, which amongst other matters, requires new development to be well-designed, contribute positively to local distinctiveness and a sense of place, and be sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of scale, height, appearance, materials and relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape features. Additionally, the proposal would comply with the guidance of the SPD for the reasons indicated.

*Living conditions*

9. The main part of the extended dwelling would be sited to the rear of the appeal property in a triangular shaped plot. The neighbouring dwelling at 18 Ash Grove is also sited within a similar shaped plot and is at a right angle to the appeal dwelling. For these reasons, there would be significant areas of space providing separation with the neighbour's garden and dwelling. As a result, there would be no significant loss of outlook for the occupiers of this neighbouring property.
10. Turning to privacy, there would similarly be significant separation distance between the new first floor dormer window and the garden and dwelling of the neighbouring property. Notwithstanding this, the dormer would mainly face the garden of the appeal property and therefore, any overlooking into the windows of the neighbouring dwelling would be so oblique as to cause negligible impact.
11. In conclusion, the extended dwelling would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, having regard to outlook and sunlight. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policy CS2 of the CS, which amongst other matters, requires new development to be well-designed and not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion and overlooking.

*Other matters*

12. Third party representations indicate that space along the cul-de-sac is restricted due to roadside car parking and there is little width to allow large vehicles to pass. However, the appeal property would have a garage, replaced as part of the proposal, and a drive providing car parking for the occupants. The proposal would be extending an existing dwelling by improving the quality of accommodation and therefore, any traffic increase would be small. For these reasons, the highway impact of the proposal would not be significant.
13. During the construction of the development, there would be a need for storage of materials, skips and visiting vehicles. Nevertheless, construction works would not be of a long-term duration due to the extension nature of the proposal. Therefore, the living conditions of neighbours and the safety of highway users would not be affected in a significant way. Requirements for adequate foundations would be a matter for Building Regulation certification. Individually and cumulatively, these considerations would not outweigh the acceptability of the proposal for all these reasons.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Jonathon Parsons*

INSPECTOR