



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2016

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/16/3148126

Sandpipers, Normandy Lane, Lymington SO41 8AE

- 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 J Boyd against the decision of the New Forest National Park Authority ('the NPA').
 - The application, Ref. 15/00838, dated 23 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2016.
 - The development proposed is the addition of dormer windows to the garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area forming part of the National Park.

Reasons

3. The NPA's objective for outbuildings is that they should be of a scale and form that results in them being perceived as ancillary to the main dwelling, with an additional factor being to preclude alterations that have the potential to facilitate unlawful conversions to self-contained units of accommodation in the National Park.
 4. The design basis for this approach can be found in pages 35 and 36 of the NPA's Design Guide SPD 2011, which includes a resistance to two storey outbuildings and the statement that outbuildings should be incidental and subservient to the main dwelling in scale and appearance. The officer's report argues that this is supported in general terms by Policies DP1, DP6 & CP8 of the NPA's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD 2010, and I do not take issue with this assertion.
 5. The NPA considers that in addition to the cumulative effect when taken with approved dormers on the north east elevation, an alteration from rooflights to dormers on the south west (Normandy Lane) elevation would be particularly harmful as it is this elevation of the outbuilding that would be read with the main house at close quarters from the public realm.
-

6. In my view this is a reasonable concern as although the dormers in themselves would be modest in scale (being reduced in size from an earlier refused proposal) and proportionate to the roof, they would increase the useable floor area and inevitably result in the perception of the building changing from an ancillary to a more overtly domestic use. Moreover, as the NPA points out, the building as approved and modified by its November 2014 permission would be entirely suitable for a first floor use as a study and games room and the proposed change from rooflights to dormers is not necessary in this regard.
7. I have carefully considered the grounds of appeal. However, the argument that the design of the garage would be improved and more in keeping with the main dwelling is paradoxically tantamount to an endorsement of the NPA's case. In respect of the view of the approved dormers and Juliet balconies from the sea wall highway, I consider that this is negated by the much greater distance to the building in that view.
8. I have taken account of all the other matters raised but have found nothing to alter my view that the proposal would harm the character of the building and the surrounding area in conflict with the above-mentioned design guidance and policies. There would also be conflict with the objectives in paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 in respect of the protection of National Parks.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR