

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2018

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

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 26<sup>th</sup> June 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/18/3201574**  
**8 Chestnut Road, Brockenhurst SO42 7RF**

- 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 M Duddridge against the decision of the New Forest National Park Authority ('the NPA').
  - The application, Ref. 18/00073, dated 29 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2018.
  - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and two storey side and rear extensions.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and two storey side and rear extensions at 8 Chestnut Road, Brockenhurst in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref.18/00073, dated 29 January 2018, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
  - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ST/01; ST/02; ST/03; ST/04/STO5 Rev. A;
  - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the appearance of the house and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene of Chestnut Road.

## Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appearance of the appeal dwelling differs markedly from the other nearby properties in Chestnut Road, these being lower profile bungalows of a 'standard' mid / late 20<sup>th</sup> century design. From the photograph in the grounds of appeal it is clear that No. 8 was originally another dwelling of this type but is now of a bespoke and individually distinctive appearance following the changes made pursuant to a permission granted in 2004.
  4. However, as the grounds of appeal point out, whether or not the NPA would prefer to distance itself from the permission of 2004 given by its predecessor
-

Authority, the building is now an established part of the street scene. To the extent that the building is now out of keeping with its surroundings, any harmful effect is reduced by its position at the head of the cul-de-sac. In any other position it would in my view appear too large and incongruous.

I acknowledge and understand that this is in any event the opinion of the NPA and of local residents who object to the proposal.

5. Fundamental to my appraisal of the appeal scheme is the technical difference of approach between the NPA and the appellant as regards the proposed additions and alterations. The former refers in both the officer's report and the Notice of Refusal to the 'original' building or house as the basis for assessment, with the authority for so doing referenced as pages 29 and 30 of the NPA's Design Guide SPD 2011.
6. However, I am minded to accept the argument in the Design and Access Statement and the grounds of appeal that it is the effect on the 'existing' building or house that is at issue. This is firstly because the cumulative approach to extensions and the resultant floorspace is more relevant to dwellings in the green belt; 'small dwellings', and those outside a 'defined village'. The appeal dwelling is none of these. Secondly, with its character and appearance so fundamentally different from the original, there is little purpose in continuing to refer to the pre-2004 building as regards either design issues or scale.
7. Applying this approach to the circumstances of this case, it appears to me that of the policies stated in the Notice of Refusal the most relevant provision is the requirement in the first paragraph of Policy DP11: 'Extensions to Dwellings' for any extension to be appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage. In addition, although not mentioned by the NPA, is Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 ('the Framework').
8. Given the assertive form of the building's front elevation arising from the large dormers and extensive weatherboarding, I consider that in applying these policies the test is whether any alterations and extensions would draw the eye from a public vantage point to a greater extent than at present. And as the appellant points out, the rear and sides of the dwelling are not prominent from the public realm and this is where the extensions would be positioned.
9. Only the proposed two storey side elevation would be visible as part of the street scene and this would be of a modest width and set down and set back in accordance with the Council's SPD. Section 3 of the Design and Access Statement illustrates how the proposal has evolved from two unacceptable and duly refused previous proposals through changes to the design and scale of the side extension. I am therefore satisfied that when seen from the front, the appearance of the building would not be harmed and the street scene would remain essentially unaltered. As regards the larger rear extensions, although not in public view, they would break up the somewhat dominating regular and square mass of the existing dormer extension to the beneficial effect of the dwelling's appearance.
10. I have taken account of the views expressed in the letters of objection but have dealt with the more fundamental points raised as part of the main issue. Overall, whilst recognising the reservations of the NPA and others as to the

change to the original house and its effect on Chestnut Road, I conclude on balance that the proposal would not cause further harm. There would therefore be no adverse conflict with the relevant sections of Policies DP1, DP6, DP11 & CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD 2010; the Design Guide SPD and the Framework.

11. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt. A condition in respect of matching external materials will ensure that the extensions harmonise with the existing house.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR