
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2016

by S Emerson BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 March 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/15/3140669

6 Honey Lane, Burley, Ringwood, BH24 4EN.

- 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 A Gallichan against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 15/00654, dated 18 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension and the removal of the existing porch and conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension and the removal of the existing porch and conservatory at 6 Honey Lane, Burley, Ringwood in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/00654, dated 18 August 2015, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1501_PP -010, -011, -012, 015, -016, -017, -018, -020 and -021.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions shall be erected to the building other than those expressly authorised by this permission.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the appearance of the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of area which is within the Burley Conservation Area.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a post-war bungalow with a suburban appearance typical of its era. It has white painted, rendered walls and fully hipped roofs with concrete interlocking tiles. A small detached garage is sited very close to the front of the building. The main element of the proposal is the demolition of the garage and the erection of a square, front extension. The extension would have a crown roof (pitched roof slopes, but with a flat roof light in the centre). The roof and elevations would be clad in slate. There would be extensive glazing, both to the extension and to the adjoining part of the existing bungalow. This glazing would be in timber frames. Various other alterations would be undertaken at the rear of the extension. The conservatory at the back of the bungalow would be demolished. In part this demolition is to ensure that the bungalow is not extended by more than 30% of its floorspace as required by policy DP11 of the New Forest National Park *Core Strategy and Development Management Policies* DPD.
4. Honey Lane is a rough forest track which serves a dozen or so properties. It has well-vegetated, wide verges and there are several large trees on the verge near the frontage of No 6. The bungalow is set back from its frontage and is not prominent from the lane. The neighbouring bungalow to the south is also well screened, but further along Honey Lane some properties are more visible.
5. Neither party has provided any comprehensive appraisal of what makes the Burley Conservation Area special. It covers a large area including the dispersed settlements of Burley and Burley Street, the large hotel at Burley Manor and its surrounding open parkland, numerous small fields, woodland and some open forest. Its overriding characteristic is its diverse patchwork of buildings, countryside and forest. In this context, Honey Lane itself is a positive element because of its traditional, rough, forest character. But the appeal property and its neighbours are of no particular significance other than as neutral elements of the built settlement. They form the eastern edge of the main cluster of development in Burley.
6. The proposed extension has a distinctive, modern design and its materials would not match those of the existing bungalow. But being different does not necessarily make a development unacceptable. The scale and form of the extension are appropriately subservient to the existing building, despite the location at the front of the building. The slopes of the crown roof match the slopes of the existing roofs; the height of the flat crown to the new roof would be below the ridge of the adjoining part of the bungalow and well below the ridge of the main roof. The present roof is clad in an interlocking concrete tile which, whilst one of the most common modern roofing tiles, is not a traditional or particularly appropriate material for a location such as Burley. Slate is a more attractive and traditional material, although clay tiles are probably the most common traditional roofing material in the area. The combination of dark slate and timber framing would make a crisp, attractive contrast to the roof and elevations of the existing building. Much of the analysis of harm in paragraph 11.4 of the Authority's delegated report does not seem to relate to this proposal.
7. From Honey Lane the appeal property is seen largely in isolation rather than as part of any particular group. The adjoining dwelling to the south is close to the boundary with No 6, but is well screened by vegetation. Accordingly, the

addition of a distinctive modern element to the appeal property would not create any visual discontinuity with adjoining buildings. The extension would make the appeal property somewhat more visible when passing along Honey Lane, but it would not be unduly prominent and not as prominent as some of the houses to the north. Views from the lane would still be filtered by vegetation. There would be no material change to the character of Honey Lane.

8. Accordingly, I consider that the extension represents a high quality design appropriate in scale, appearance, siting and materials to the host building given its particular context. The development would not harm the character or appearance of the area. The building as extended would continue to make a neutral contribution to the conservation area, the character and appearance of which would be maintained. There is no conflict with design policies DP1, DP6 or DP11 of the Core Strategy, or with policy CP7 to protect the historic built environment, which includes conservation areas.
9. The appeal should therefore be allowed subject to conditions. I have considered the need for conditions in the light of national guidance and the Authority's suggested list. Final details of the external materials should be approved by the Council in the interests of visual amenity and the submitted plans should be adhered to so that there is certainty as to what is to be built. The Council has suggested tree protection measures and a landscaping condition, but I consider neither necessary. The most important trees are on the verge of Honey Lane outside the application site. Within the front garden there are a variety of garden shrubs. Whilst these no doubt contribute to the attractiveness of the plot, there is little purpose in giving protection to these during construction as they are not plants for long term retention. Similarly, whilst the appellant has suggested additional planting within the garden, I do not regard that as essential to the acceptability of the scheme. Given the need to comply with the restriction in policy DP11 on the overall scale of extensions it is reasonable and necessary to remove permitted development rights for further extensions.

Simon Emerson

Inspector