



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/21/3273403

Danehurst, Wootton Road, Tiptoe SO41 6FT

- 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 Steven Jose against the decision of New Forest National Park.
 - The application Ref 20/00857, dated 18 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'formation of two storey residential extension to south west of existing property with pitched roof, brickwork facades and windows to match the existing building'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the proposal from the planning application form which varies from that on the decision notice and appeal form. I have taken this description of development as there is no evidence that this change has been agreed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed extension meets the Authority's strategy for the extension of existing dwellings within the New Forest National Park (the 'National Park') in the context of adopted policy.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling situated in a semi-rural location within the National Park. The property has been previously extended and it is now proposed to construct a two-storey side extension to the property. The appellants confirm the floor area of this extension to be 9.39 square metres.
5. Policy DP36 of the Local Plan New Forest National Park Local Plan (2019)(LP) seeks to limit the cumulative size of additions to dwellings in order to safeguard the locally distinctive character of the New Forest and ensure the retention of a balance in the housing stock. For dwellings which are not small dwellings and are outside the defined villages, as is the case of the appeal property, the

policy states that extensions must not increase the floorspace of the existing dwelling by more than 30%.

6. Paragraph 7.82, part of the supportive text for Policy DP36, explains that the term 'existing dwelling' means the the dwelling as it existed on 1 July 1982, or as the dwelling was originally built or legally established, if the residential use postdates 1 July 1982.
7. The Council states that the existing floorspace of the appeal property, as defined by the supportive text for Policy DP36, was 248 square metres. Cumulatively, the previous enlargement of the property and the appeal proposal would give rise to a floorspace of 360 square metres. This would represent an increase of 45% in the amount of habitable floor area of the dwelling as it existed on 1 July 1982. These calculations are not disputed by the appellants. As such, the proposal would fail to comply with the permitted 30% increase allowed under Policy DP36.
8. I recognise that the property sits in a secluded location and that the design of the proposed extension would reflect the context of the host dwelling. In addition, I accept that that the proposal is relatively small in scale and the use of the dwelling would be unlikely intensify as a result of this proposal. Nevertheless, these matters do not overcome or outweigh the weighty conflict with Policy DP36 which seeks to limit the extension of existing properties in order to prevent the harmful incremental extension of dwellings within the National Park, which is a nationally designated landscape.
9. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposed extension would exceed the 30% criterion set out in Policy DP36 of the LP and would represent an unacceptably large dwelling in relation to the existing property. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy DP36, which seeks to restrict the extension of existing homes in order to prevent the harmful incremental extension of dwellings within the National Park. It would also conflict with Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the scheme would improve the appellants' existing living conditions. While I appreciate the appellants' desire to provide living space more suitable to their needs, it has not been shown that this is the only way of achieving the appellants' aims of providing additional space. Therefore, I give this matter limited weight.
11. Similarly, whilst I note that the Parish Council does not object to the proposal, support, or a lack of objection, to a scheme is not a reason in itself to allow development.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
13. For the reasons given above, and having to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR