

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 January 2018

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/17/3184143

Derriere, Southampton Road, Landford, Salisbury SP5 2BE

- 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 & Mrs Garry Miller against the decision of the New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 17/00397, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is for new roof to facilitate additional accommodation, new conservatory and extension of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: 1) whether the proposal would maintain a balanced housing stock within the National Park; and 2) the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, specifically whether it would conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park.

Reasons

Balance of Housing Stock

3. The appeal site is situated within the New Forest National Park and is at the end of a single track private lane which serves a garden centre and three other residential properties accessed off the A36.
4. Policy DP11 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD December 2010 (CSDMP) stipulates that extensions to 'existing dwellings' will be permitted provided they are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage; and in the case of 'other dwellings' outside the defined villages, the extension must not increase the floorspace of the existing dwelling by more than 30%.
5. 'Existing dwelling' is defined within paragraph 7.39 of the CSDMP as meaning the dwelling as it existed on 1 July 1982. There is not an explanation as to how this date was set, however it supports Policy DP11 which forms part of the Development Plan, and against which planning decisions must be made, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6. Preceding the policy within the Development Plan in paragraph 7.36, the supporting text highlights that proposals to extend dwellings can affect the locally distinctive character of the New Forest and increasing the size of dwellings has the potential to cause an imbalance in the range and mix of housing stock available. It is for these reasons it is considered important by the Council to limit the size of extensions to dwellings and, therefore, include a more detailed development management policy on the issue.
7. The Council Officer's Report highlights that the internal floorspace of the property as it would have existed in July 1982 measured 149m², with the current floor area being 192m², including the extension, garage conversion and pool room built under two 1988 planning permissions, as well as the projecting element of the front conservatory that was also added post 1982. The Council highlight that these existing additions, excluding the pool room, increased the floorspace by 29% and consequently, when taking the pool room into account, the additions to Derriere to date have already exceeded the 30% threshold set by CSDMP Policy DP11.
8. The Council also stipulate that the current proposal would result in a total habitable floorspace, including the previous extensions, alterations and pool room of 391m² which would be a 163% increase over and above the property as it stood in 1982. Therefore, whilst it may be that no additional significant increase in width or footprint of the property would occur as a result of the proposal, nonetheless, when taking into account the cumulative additions, I find that the proposal would give rise to a substantial increase in floorspace. I note that the appellant does not dispute the percentage figures put before me and irrespective of whether or not the swimming pool enclosure was included as habitable area, the threshold would clearly be exceeded by a significant margin.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would fail to maintain a balance in the National Park's housing stock and could add to pressures for change damaging to the long term future of the countryside, contrary to CSDMP Policy DP11.

Character and Appearance

10. I noted on my site visit that the dwelling known as Park Farm and Forest Oak adjacent to the appeal site are chalet bungalows, with Salem in between them being a detached bungalow, much like Derriere albeit of a far lesser footprint. Derriere itself is quite rambling, with a flat roof extension to the rear, a conservatory porch to the front and the aforementioned attached pool building, along with a double garage attached with a carport link in between. I also accept that it is of a tired appearance, and therefore could do with some improvements.
11. I have already noted that the overall footprint of the appeal dwelling would not materially increase as a result of the proposal, although the same could not be said of the height, with a significant increase in ridge line than is currently the case. The dwelling, being at the end of the private track is surrounded by open countryside to its south eastern and south western sides; and whilst it would include architectural features that could be more traditional than those currently found on the existing bungalow, overall the scale of the dwelling would significantly increase.

12. Consequently, the increased bulk would conflict with the advice as set out within the New Forest National Park Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document December 2011 (SPD) which states that extensions should be compatible with the main building, avoiding significant impact on the scale of the core or original element and minimise bulk, by setting back with reduced height and smaller roof spans.
13. I accept that the property is located to the rear of a substantial commercial nursery complex, it is nonetheless, within a relatively isolated location. I also accept that the use of natural materials would be a benefit, particularly in replacing concrete tiles and plastic windows. Therefore, whilst the proposal, in terms of its detail, would be more in keeping with the rural vernacular and the new roof would be no higher than the adjoining property, the proposal would give rise to a dwelling of a significantly greater scale which would fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park.
14. I have already found the proposal contrary to CSDMP Policy DP11 which seeks to restrict the size of extensions to existing dwellings, as well as with the SPD. I also find the proposal contrary to CSDMP Policies DP1, DP6 and CP8 which seek to prevent built development which would individually or cumulatively erode the National Park's local character; require all new development to achieve the highest standards for the design, external appearance and location of new development within the National Park; and ensure that development is appropriate and sympathetic in terms of scale.

Conclusion

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

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR