



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/22/3296593

Cotswold, Bashley Road, Bashley, New Milton, Hampshire, BH25 5RX

- 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 A. Gosheron against the decision of the New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 21/00980, dated 3 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as dormer and part hip to gable alterations to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the wider street scene: and,
 - b) whether the proposal, taking into account a previous enlargement, would result in a building which would be unacceptably large in relation to the original dwelling and would thereby undesirably add to pressures for change which are damaging to the future of the countryside.

Reasons

First main issue

3. Cotswold is a modest, detached chalet bungalow, that is rectangular in plan with a simple vernacular hipped roof and a single storey flat roofed rear addition. The main façade of the property is open to view from the road.
4. The appellants propose a hip to gable roof alteration to the roof and the construction of a new dormer on the north-west roof slope.
5. Policy DP2 of the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016-2036 (August 2019) (LP) at criterion a) requires new development to be appropriate and sympathetic in terms of scale, appearance, form sitting and layout.
6. The proposed flat roofed dormer to the side roof slope would be a typical modest, well-mannered, vernacular addition. Accordingly, I do not consider

- that it would cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property or the wider area.
7. The proposed hip to part hip/part gable alterations to the front and rear roof slopes would denude the existing simple hipped roof form of the existing chalet bungalow. Further, unlike a traditional gablet style/barn hip roof the gable element of the roof proposed here would be the proportionately much larger than the retained hip roof. To my mind the new roof would therefore appear contrived, awkward and unattractive.
 8. On balance, in my judgement this alteration would not be sympathetic to the established character and appearance to the host property and would appear as a visually awkward feature.
 9. I have found the proposed dormer to be acceptable. However, the proposed alterations to the pitched roof would cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby, as the main façade is open to view from the street, the street view itself.
 10. Accordingly, I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the host property and the street scene. This would therefore be contrary to the aims of LP Policies DP2, DP18 and the National Planning Policy Framework, that along with other things, requires proposal to demonstrate a high quality of design and to be contextually appropriate.

Second main issue

11. From the Council's evidence, and this is not disputed by the appellants, I understand that the dwelling is located outside any of the defined 'New Forest Villages', and it is also considered to be a 'Small Dwelling', having had a floor space of approximately 66 square metres on 1st July 1982. Furthermore, being a small dwelling located outside one of the defined New Forest Villages the 30% exceptions rule does not apply.
12. LP Policy DP36 seeks to limit the proportional increase in the size of small dwellings, such as that here where extensions must not result in a total internal habitable floorspace exceeding 100 square meters.
13. The underling objective of the policy, as set out in the preamble to the policy, is to retain the locally distinctive character of the New Forest's built environment, maintain a balance and mix of housing, including a stock of smaller sized dwellings.
14. As I saw on site the current first floor runs right into the eaves. Accordingly, the proposed alterations to the roof and the formation of the dormer would not increase the existing floor area. However, by reference to the guidance in the Council's Planning Information Leaflet – *Domestic Extensions and Replacement Dwellings* the habitable floor area in roof voids is to be measured at 1.5 metres above floor level. Accordingly, as illustrated, the proposed development would result in the habitable floor space being enlarged.
15. The Council states that the floor area of the property as extended would be 109.7 square metres, therefore 9.7 square metres over the 100 square metres maximum allowed under the policy. However, it does not set out its calculations.

16. Based therefore on the appellants figures the current habitable floor area of the existing property is ground floor 91.9 square metres + first floor 10.77 square metres (measured above 1.5 metres) = 102.67 square metres.
17. The proposed floor area as extended being ground floor 91.9 square metres + first floor 15.0 square metres = 106.90. The resultant total increase in floor area would therefore amount to 4.23 square meters.
18. However, as the existing floor area is already 2.67 square meters in excess of the maximum floor area for a small dwelling of 100 square metres, the total excess in floor area above the policy maximum would amount to some 6.90 square meters.
19. While the overall increase in floor area would be relatively small, even if the Council's calculation of 9.7 square metres is correct, in numerical terms and in the context of previous extensions, it is nevertheless contrary to the guidance set out in LP Policy DP36.
20. Accordingly, as I have found that the development would in any case cause harm to the character of the host property and the street scene, I am not persuaded that in this case a departure from the policy would be appropriate.

I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposal, when taking the previous enlargement into account would result in a building which would be unacceptably large in relation to the original dwelling and would thereby undesirably add to pressures for change which are damaging to the future of the countryside, contrary to LP Policy DP36.

Other Matters

21. My attention has been drawn to an appeal decision APP/B9506/D/21/3288303. I have considered this decision but find that as well as not dealing with a defined 'small dwelling' unlike here the Inspector found that the proposal did not raise any specific issues that were in conflict with the development plan as a whole. I have therefore given this decision little weight in my deliberations.

Conclusions

22. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR