
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2016

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

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

Decision date: 24 June 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/16/3149631

Home View, Pollards Moor Road, Copythorne, Hampshire SO40 2NZ

- 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 P Ravnbo-West against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 16/00068, dated 29 January 2016, was refused by the Authority by notice dated 13 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations to include raised ridge height and dormer windows to facilitate additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the Pollards Moor Road and Winsor Road area of Copythorne.

Reasons

3. The site is on the east side of Pollards Moor Road and backs onto part of the Forest North East Conservation Area. It is separated also from the boundary of that designated area by two dwellings to the south, shown as 'Forest Gate' and 'Robins' on the site plan, and the conservation area boundary extends a little way north on the opposite side of the road to take in the grounds and building of the Village Hall together with further buildings to the west along both sides of Winsor Road.
 4. Whilst the requirement of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area does not refer to setting, the effect on views into and out of conservation areas is a material consideration in their protection. Paragraph 7.10 of the Conservation Area Appraisal states that it is important that development on the edge or immediately outside of the conservation area boundary does not have a detrimental impact on views into and out of the conservation area.
 5. New Forest National Park Core Strategy Policies DP1 on general development principles and DP6 on design principles seek a high quality design, sympathetic in terms of scale, appearance, form, siting and layout, and respecting the natural and built environment. Extensions to dwellings are the subject of Policy DP11 and these will be permitted provided that they are appropriate to the
-

- existing dwelling and its curtilage. Policy CP7 on the built environment seeks to protect important sites and features and Policy CP8 aims to avoid erosion of local character and a gradual sub-urbanising effect in the National Park.
6. The Authority has adopted a 'Design Guide' as a Supplementary Planning Document and this states that extensions can combine sustainable eco-characteristics with improved appearance. They are to be compatible with the main building, avoiding significant impact on the scale of the core or original element and should reflect established scale to avoid increased impact and forced grandeur. The Authority has referred to pages 25 and 26 but whilst stating advice on good design, they are in the 'new and replacement dwelling' section and not the 'extensions' section.
 7. Both parties have referred to the National Planning Policy Framework, to the three dimensions of sustainable development, section 7 on requiring good design and section 12 on the historic environment. In particular paragraph 60 states that planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. The Framework goes on to say that it is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
 8. Looking in more detail at the Conservation Area Appraisal, land to the rear is in character area C: '*dispersed farms and arable land*' which contains much detail of the natural and built environment there. The land to the south and opposite is in character area B: '*Winsor*' described as an historic settlement although it is unclear as to why the modern Village Hall and car park are included. Nevertheless, the part of area B along Winsor Road near the site is clearly of interest described in the appraisal as '*a particularly prominent group of buildings demonstrating this later period of development exists to the southwest of the junction with Pollards Moor Road on the south side of Winsor Road.*' Photograph 5 in the Winsor Character Area section shows just such a view of cottages opposite the end of Pollards Moor Road and these are visible also in views that encompass the appeal site. The features of the buildings in that and photograph 6 among others in the appraisal share characteristics with the appeal building.
 9. It appears that there was a previous scheme to provide an additional floor of accommodation in an enlarged roof. The appellant is of the view that the appeal scheme addresses the previous reasons for refusal. The roof height has been lowered and roof-lights would replace the previously proposed front dormers, these features now being to the rear only. The intention is to cover a previous flat-roofed addition to the rear with the new pitched roof, resulting in the re-use of the plane of the front roof pitch, but extended upward and rearward on the same plane to a new higher ridge, before dropping at the same pitch to the far eaves of the flat roof. The existing chimneys would be extended upward to give the same height additional to the roof.
 10. The flat roofed extension, stated by the Authority to date from the late 1960s, is an unattractive aspect of the present dwelling, and it is clearly visible from the road due to there being lower dwellings to both sides. The appellant refers to it as being unsightly and is of the view that it would be improved by the works. Certainly the proposal would incorporate the extension within the overall pitched-roofed enlarged dwelling, but the shortcoming of the extension

is not restricted to its flat roof, but concerns the use of what appeared to be 'common' brickwork and the failure to match with the original brickwork is particularly jarring. It is unclear how that would be dealt with, the application form referring only to facing bricks. It is noted that photograph 5 shows a cottage with a rear projection that has a roof at right angles to the main roof, one of the types referred to in the Design Guide as being acceptable. It is clear that whilst the appeal scheme addresses one aspect of this unattractive addition, there are other ways of improving its appearance.

11. The proposed addition would effectively replace the small cottage-style building set among low-built dwellings, with a grander and more assertive building, at odds with the scale of development nearby and failing to accord with the Design Guide aims of avoiding significant impact on the scale of the core or original element. The enlarged building would appear over-dominant and out-of-place in the surrounding grain of built form, and would erode the interest of views into the conservation area from the north along Pollards Moor Road.
12. It is the case that the bungalow to the south has a high and prominent roofline, as do other such single storey dwellings in the area, but this is due to the roof covering a large floor area. The failing in the case of the appeal building is the resulting height relative to the nearby built form, and particularly the effect that this has on the character and appearance of the building form, recognisable as a locally distinctive cottage.
13. The proposal would fail to accord with guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document, and the aims of the Framework on good design, together with a failure to satisfy the environmental role of sustainable development through not '*contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment*'. It would not meet the aims of Policies DP1 and DP6 on design, and Policy DP11 on extensions through not being appropriate to the existing dwelling. The proposal would erode an aspect of the local character contrary to Policy CP8, which would have an adverse effect on the setting of the conservation area, one of the aims of the Appraisal. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR