



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by **J Wilson BA Hons BTP MRTPI DMS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/19/3233420

May Cottage, St Johns Road, Bashley, New Milton, Hampshire BH25 5SB

- 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 and Mrs J Wilding against the decision of the New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 19/00164, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension and alterations to the roof of an existing extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a rear extension and alterations to the roof of an existing extension at May Cottage, St Johns Road, Bashley, New Milton, Hampshire BH25 5SB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00164, dated 25 February 2019, 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: MCW 01, MCW 02, MCW 03, MCW 04, MCW 05, MCW 06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the walls and pitched roof of the single storey extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building in colour and texture.

Preliminary Matter

2. The New Forest National Parks Authority (NPA) has highlighted that the final Inspectors Report into the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (NFNPLP) has been published along with a list of required main modifications. This plan will not be formally considered for adoption for several weeks however, the modifications do not affect the content of the policies relied upon by the NPA in this appeal. They will be carried forward into the NFNPLP with different reference numbers, but this change does not affect my consideration of the issues relating to this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the National Park.

Reasons

4. May Cottage is a traditional double fronted cottage of modest proportions. It occupies a substantial plot and is one amongst a row of properties of varied appearance and detailing located on a rural lane. The property has an existing wrap around single storey extension which is barely visible from outside the site due to mature vegetation at the front and rear of the property and from the side by timber fencing. The proposal would enlarge the rear single storey extension and incorporate a small pitch over the front part of the garage.
5. Policy DP11 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2010) (CS&DMP) relates to extensions to dwellings requiring that enlargements are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage. The proposal would not add additional floorspace above the recommended limits in Policy DP11 when regarded against the already extended dwelling, though it would be marginally greater than the footprint of the original cottage. Nonetheless in relation to the cottage it would not, in my view, have any greater impact visually on the original cottage than the existing single storey extension. It would not, in design terms, be harmful to the character and appearance of the area nor would it compromise the locally distinct appearance of May Cottage when seen from public view.
6. Design Policy DP6 of the CS&DMP requires the highest standards of design and external appearance. Despite the continuation of the existing flat roof over an additional rear projection the detailing would be altered to re-face the existing extension in brick more closely aligned to the original house. Existing windows in the single storey extension would be replaced to incorporate details to reflect those in the main house which would better reflect the original architectural detailing.
7. I am mindful that the definition in the Local Plan measures enlargements against those which existed on 1 July 1982. Evidence indicates that the existing extension dates from 1971 and the NPA's concern is that the cumulative enlargement would result in a disproportionately large addition which would fail to be subservient to the original cottage. However, this is not the effect of the application of Policy DP11 in relation to the existing dwelling as defined in the plan.
8. As the site lies within the New Forest National Park there is a statutory duty to have regard to the purposes of its designation. These are conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of its special qualities by the public.
9. Having regard to all these factors, and in the absence of any substantive design harm, the proposal would not be unsympathetic to the existing cottage nor would it harm the character and appearance of the area. In this respect I find no conflict with Policies DP1, DP6, DP11 or CP8 of the CS&DMP nor would there be any harm to the purposes of the National Park designation.

Conditions

10. The NPA has suggested three conditions relating to timescales, plans and materials to be attached to any grant of planning permission should the appeal be allowed. I have considered these in the light of Government guidance. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved drawings would be necessary for reasons of certainty.
11. A condition requiring external materials to match the existing building is necessary to ensure that the brick and roofing material choice matches the existing in terms of colour and texture in order to secure a satisfactory finished appearance to the building and to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed in accordance with the formal decision above.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR