



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2016

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/16/3152403

Queens Close, The Cross, Burley, Ringwood, BH24 4AA

- 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 Mr J Bishop against the decision the New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 16/00152, dated 22 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached outbuilding with first floor study/store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the planning application form; I note the Appellant also uses this description on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

4. Queens Close is a substantial attractive detached dwelling which lies in an elevated position above The Cross and the Queen's Head Hotel in the centre of Burley with substantial off-site tree growth around its edges. The locality is varied and the buildings and landscape come together to form an area of established village character and extremely pleasing appearance. The application is to replace an existing modest garage/car port structure with a detached two-storey outbuilding, comprising a two-bay garage and car port with a study/store over. The scheme includes two dormer windows and an external staircase. The building would have a footprint of around 70m² and a height of up to 7m to the ridge of the pitched roof.

Character and appearance

5. The site lies within the Burley Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area
-

(CA). Policy CP7 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (DPD) (December 2010) (CS) reflects this.

6. This would be a substantial size of outbuilding by any measure and there would be an ungainly appearance to the structure brought about as a result of its overall scale and bulk, its failure to properly reflect ground levels, the awkward wide span to gable relationship and the two dormer windows 'floating' above a car port void and being embodied as bold features in what should be a subservient building in a garden. The situation would not be helped by the scheme both running along close to the side boundary of the curtilage and also significantly cutting across the main house frontage at both proximity and unusual angle. The outbuilding would go beyond what could reasonably be seen as incidental, subordinate or appropriate to the dwelling and even this large curtilage. It would not accord with the landscape led scene in this part of the village albeit there would only be public realm glimpses of the structure. The effect on the plot and in the immediate vicinity would be a suburbanising one and this overly large, overly embellished, outbuilding would be excessive and not conducive to protecting or enhancing character and appearance and the important local aesthetic.
7. Policies DP1, CP8 and DP6 of the CS taken together and amongst other matters seek well designed sympathetic development which respects the natural and built environment, protects local distinctiveness and would not lead to a suburbanising effect. The objectives of the Authority's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document mirror these aspects albeit the guidance cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the cited development plan policies and purposes of the guidance. It would also run contrary to the aims of S72(1) of the Act and Policy CP7 of the CS because there would not be preservation or enhancement of character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Other matters

8. I sympathise with the Appellant's wish to increase and improve the ancillary accommodation at this property on this relatively generous plot. I have considered the other examples of outbuildings drawn to my attention but find none to be directly comparable by reason of their location, size, siting or design. In any event I must assess the case before me on its own merits. I can see that proposed materials have been carefully selected and agree that the degree of screening from most vantage points is significant. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the natural and built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be, such as construction employment, would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR