



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2019

by **Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/18/3219257

Manor Bank Cottage, Main Road, East Boldre SO42 7WT

- 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 Mrs Felicity James Smith against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 18/00706, dated 28 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey side extension to form utility, study and wet room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey side extension to form utility, study and wet room at Manor Bank Cottage, Main Road, East Boldre SO42 7WT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 18/00706, dated 28 August 2018, 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0261-01, 0261-02, 0261-06, 0261-07.
 - 3) The external render to be used in the development shall match that used on the existing building, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the New Forest National Park Authority.
 - 4) Prior to installation, details of the roof finish shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the New Forest National Park Authority. Development shall only take place in accordance with those details which have been approved.
 - 5) Prior to installation, joinery details relating to windows and eaves shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the New Forest National Park Authority. Development shall only take place in accordance with those details which have been approved.
 - 6) The work hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Tree Protection Statement and drawing no 0261-03.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be a suitable addition to the dwelling which would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Forest South East Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Manor Bank Cottage is a large dwelling set well back from the highway in private grounds, in the rural settlement of East Boldre and located within the Forest South East Conservation Area (CA). I therefore have duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The significance of this part of the CA is derived from rectangular cob and thatched roofed cottages and the prevalence of buildings with long, low, linear floor plans. Properties on the east side of East Boldre, including Manor Bank Cottage, are separated from adjacent land by an historic tree lined field boundary known as the Beaulieu Rails.
4. Manor Bank Cottage was originally two buildings and its past development is indicated by the assorted location and size of its openings and its roof arrangement. A modern single storey extension with two dual pitched thatched roofs has been added at its eastern side but it has an otherwise linear plan. The Council describes the property as compact, but I find it rather sprawling in its scale. Therefore, although the house is attractive and has historic interest, it draws its significance from its varietal appearance and its evolution over time.
5. The extension would be subservient and inconspicuously located at the far end of the dwelling, set back from its front and rear building lines and behind its flank wall. It would modestly elongate the building, but this would add enhancing emphasis to its already low and linear form. The roof would not be thatched, but I consider this to be an acceptable approach which would allow identification of the extension as a modern addition to the property. The cottage has a busy roof profile with various converging roof slopes, and I do not consider that the junction between the extension and the dwelling would be awkward within this context.
6. Although the proposal would draw the dwelling physically closer to the adjacent field, it would be in the location of an existing domestic patio within the clear confines of the garden area. Physical separation between the dwelling and the field boundary would remain. As such, the proposal would not encroach harmfully upon the Beaulieu Rails or challenge the clear delineation between the settlement and surrounding field pattern.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be a suitable addition to the dwelling which would preserve the character and appearance of the Forest South East Conservation Area. In this respect it would comply with Policies DP6, DP11, CP7 and CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (CSDMP) (adopted 2010), the Design Guide SPD and the design and heritage aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have also found no conflict with the sections of the emerging policies cited by the Council within the evidence.

Conditions

8. In the event that the appeal was allowed the Council suggested conditions to be applied, which I have assessed with regard to the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have amended them where appropriate for the sake of clarity and precision. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have used conditions relating to joinery and finish materials to ensure that the extension would be a high-quality addition to the property. Having had regard to the tree officer's comments, I

have added a condition to ensure compliance with the appellant's submitted tree protection measures.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Matthew Jones

INSPECTOR