



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2023

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/22/3307776

Cruachan, Chapel Lane, Redlynch, SP5 2HN

- 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 & Mrs Gibson against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref. 22/00374, dated 6 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension; alterations to doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey extension; alterations to doors at Cruachan, Chapel Lane, Redlynch, SP5 2HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 22/00374 dated 6 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DAK/CL/01; DAK/CL/02; DAK/CL/03; DAK/CL/04; DAK/CL/05; DAK/CL/06; DAK/CL/07; DAK/CL/08; DAK/CL/09; DAK/CL/10; DAK/CL/11; DAK/CL/12; DAK/CL/13.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development on the decision notice as this is more concise.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the appeal proposal accords with local policies seeking to limit the scale of extensions to dwellings outside the Defined Villages in order to protect the locally distinctive character of and avoid an imbalance in the range and mix of housing stock within the New Forest National Park.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Chapel Lane and comprises a detached two storey property within a spacious plot. The surrounding area comprises similar detached property's, including some single storey bungalows, a mixture of old and new that vary in terms of their design, scale, layout, form and materials. All of the properties form part of a small rural settlement known as Redlynch.
5. The appeal proposal includes alterations to the existing kitchen doors at the rear of the host property to which the Council have not raised any objection, which is a finding I concur with. The Council do object to the proposal to construct a single storey side extension which would be used as a utility room, allowing the existing internal utility room to be incorporated into a larger kitchen and dining area.
6. Policy DP36 of the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (August 2019) (Local Plan) states that extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted provided they are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage. The policy continues by stating that extensions to dwellings outside the Defined Villages must not increase the floorspace of the existing dwelling by more than 30%, unless there are exceptional circumstances. The supporting text at paragraph 7.82 defines existing dwelling as those which existed on 1 July 1982 or as originally built if they post-date 1 July 1982. This policy must be read in conjunction with policy SP17, which deals with local distinctiveness and states that new development that individually or cumulatively erodes the Park's character or results in a gradual suburbanising effect within the National Park will not be permitted.
7. A two storey extension to the existing (original) dwelling was granted planning permission in April 2003 and subsequently built. The parties agree that this extension resulted in an increase in floorspace of 75% compared to the existing (original) dwelling. This permission was granted prior to the formation of the National Park Authority and under a former local plan that did not include floorspace restrictions on extensions. Even so, the proposed extension would add a further 4.3 square metres of floorspace, resulting in a cumulative increase in floorspace of 77% compared to the existing (original) dwelling.
8. Within the above context, the appeal site is not located within a Defined Village and no exceptional circumstances have been put forward. Consequently, the proposed extension would, in conjunction with the 2003 extension, exceed the 30% limit and in this respect it would conflict with policy DP36. Even so, the appeal proposal would not, in my view, conflict with the overall purpose and objectives of policy DP36. The latter are set out in paragraph 7.79 of the supporting text and relate to the harmful effect of incremental extensions on the locally distinctive character of the built environment of the National Park and the imbalance to the overall housing stock through the loss of smaller sized dwellings.
9. The proposed extension would involve the creation of a small utility room, enabling the kitchen to be enlarged to accommodate a dining area. There would be no increase in the number of bedrooms and it would remain a large family house. There is also no evidence before me to indicate that the extension would have any effect on the value of the property. The proposal would not lead, therefore, to any imbalance in the range and mix of housing stock or lead to the loss of a smaller sized dwelling.

10. The proposal would involve a small scale extension to the side of the host property, set back from its frontage to Chapel Lane, replacing an existing gate with brick piers and timber arch. The proposal would comprise only 4.3 square metres of floorspace, with a mono pitch roof and brickwork and other detailing to match existing. As such, the proposed extension would be very modest and discrete and would appear as a logical and traditional addition to the host property. There would be no material impact, either individually or cumulatively, on the local character or distinctiveness of this part of the Park and neither would such a small extension result in any harmful suburbanising effect or lead to the gradual erosion of the National Park's special character.
11. Given the individual circumstances of this case, the appeal sites local context including its location within a rural settlement that has no uniform character and as the proposal would not be that visible within the distinctive character of the built environment of the New Forest or its protected landscape, in my view, the proposal is, on balance, acceptable. There is no substantive evidence before me that would lead me to find that the extension would harmfully conflict with or undermine any of the purposes and objectives to policy DP36. Moreover, I note that the Council accepts that the design and form of the proposal would accord with policy DP2 of the Local Plan in that it is sympathetic and appropriate to the host property in terms of its appearance, siting, layout and materials. This lends further support to my own findings.
12. I find, therefore, that whilst the new extension would conflict with the 30% floorspace limit in policy DP36 of the Local Plan, the proposal would not lead to any harm to the rural and locally distinctive character of this part of the New Forest National Park and would also not affect the balance of the housing stock in this part of the Park. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in any harm to or conflict with the aims and objectives of policies SP17 and DP36, and would also not conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.

Conditions

13. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is necessary and reasonable to reflect the details included within the application. I have, however, added a list of approved plans for clarity. A condition that requires the proposal to be built in materials to match existing is also necessary and reasonable to reflect the details shown in the application and to ensure a high quality design.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR