



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2019

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/19/3227989

18 Wellands Road, Lyndhurst SO43 7AD

- 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 S Roche against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 18/00970, dated 30 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is addition of dormers to side of roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Lyndhurst Conservation Area having particular regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. Number 18 Wellands Road (No 18) is located on the edge of the Lyndhurst Conservation Area (CA), an area which is described in the *Lyndhurst, Swan Green and Bank Conservation Area Character Appraisals 2010* as 'an eclectic mix of ages and architectural styles, but the unifying theme is the use of traditional materials particularly brick, tile and slate.' The consistency of design and materials within late Victorian and early Edwardian properties are also identified as important characteristics of the CA.
4. No 18 is a traditional, two-storey semi-detached house with a pitched roof and a small two-storey rear addition. It is brick built with a slate roof, characteristic of properties within the CA, and retains its original form and traditional windows. The property has an uncluttered appearance with clean lines. These features of the property make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and thereby its significance. The Authority's Building Design and Conservation Officer has stated that No 18 is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.
5. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) says that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In

weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required have regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

6. Wellands Road is characterised by a mix of attractive housing, in a variety of styles. Whilst the appeal site and adjacent car park is located within the CA, most of Wellands Road is not. The house is located adjacent to a small supermarket car park and is clearly visible from both the car park and Wellands Road.
7. The proposed flat-roofed dormer windows would be within the side elevation of the roof, positioned below the ridge and above the eaves. The forward most dormer would be aligned with a chimney towards the front of the roof and the rearmost one, with a first floor window. The dormers would be clad in 'lead type material'.
8. The dormers would appear as symmetrical additions to the roof, positioned away from both the ridge and eaves which would help to reduce their bulk and dominance on the building. However, they would both be wide and with a flat roof they would have a horizontal emphasis and boxy appearance. The introduction of these features would alter the original roofscape of this house and introduce visual clutter at roof level. The windows would be wider than those at first floor level and would fail to relate to the existing vertical proportions and appearance of the property. The use of artificial lead would not match the existing materials, which are strong feature of both the building itself and characteristic of the wider CA. However, the use of materials is a matter which could be addressed through the imposition of an appropriate condition should the development be acceptable in all other respects.
9. The dormers, due to their width, would consequently appear top heavy and out of scale with the host dwelling. They would therefore adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing house. As required by paragraph 197 of the Framework, I must consider the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The dormers would result in less than substantial harm to the non-designated heritage asset.
10. Due to their position on the side elevation overlooking an area of car park, the dormers would be clearly visible and very prominent in the locality. The contribution that the host property would make to the CA would be significantly diminished as a result. The proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as is required by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
11. The dormer would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, namely the conservation area. As required by paragraph 196 of the Framework harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the additional accommodation would be a benefit for the appellant but would not provide a wider public benefit.
12. I conclude that there would be insufficient public benefit arising from the proposal to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the Lyndhurst Conservation Area. I attach considerable importance and weight to the harm that would be caused. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DP1, CP7, CP8 and DP6 of the New Forest National Park (NFNP) Core Strategy and Development Management Policies

DPD 2010 which together seek development to be of a high standard of design that enhances the built heritage of the New Forest, is appropriate in scale, appearance and materials, and respects the built environment and local character. It would also not meet the requirements of the NFNP Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 which seeks extensions to be compatible with the main building.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR