



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2023

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/W/22/3307702

1 Sunnyside Cottages, Southampton Road, Cadnam, SO40 2NH

- 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 Ms S Taylor against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref. 22/00305, dated 10 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is cladding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for cladding at 1 Sunnyside Cottages, Southampton Road, Cadnam, SO40 2NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 22/00305, dated 10 April 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 be in accordance with those shown in the Application Form.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TQRQM22114172313376; TQRQM22114173241777; DR1; and DR2.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development on the decision notice as this is more concise.
3. The Appellants submission has raised complaints over the process that led to Copythorne Parish Council (CPC) objecting to the planning application, which they contend was biased and unjustly influenced by a conflict of interest. This is not a matter that I can comment on in the context of an appeal that has been submitted under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Should the Appellant wish to pursue these complaints further, they are matters that should be taken up directly with CPC or with the National Park Authority or both, if they have not already done so.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the New Forest National Park.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the northern side of Southampton Road and comprises a semi-detached two storey property with an open frontage for parking and a garden with various outbuildings at the rear. The surrounding area largely comprises a mixture of semi-detached and detached two storey properties, a mixture of old and new that vary in terms of their design, scale, layout, form and pallet of materials. All of the properties form part of a small rural settlement known as Cadnam located east of the M27.
6. The appeal proposal involves the cladding of the upper part to the front and rear elevations in grey composite cladding with a wood grained effect. The cladding on the front elevation has already been installed, whereas the rear elevation remains clad in the original concrete tiles.
7. Policy DP2 of the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (August 2019) (Local Plan) states that new development should, amongst other requirements: promote the principles of sustainable development; seek to respect the natural, built and historic environment and landscape character of the National Park; and use materials that are appropriate to the site and setting. This policy should be read in conjunction with policy SP17 which states that development either individually or cumulatively should not erode the Park's character or result in a gradual suburbanising effect. Also, policy DP18 which states, amongst other requirements, that development, including materials, should achieve the highest standards of design.
8. The Council have also referred to the New Forest National Park Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (January 2022) (SPD). However, I have only been provided with a copy of the cover and page 44 to this SPD, where paragraph 5.22 states that the use of composite cladding should be "avoided" as it can appear overly suburban and standardised.
9. Within the above context and as I observed on site, the rear elevation to the host property is well screened by existing outbuildings and boundary screening. There are no public views and the proposed cladding would not have any harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area.
10. As I confirmed earlier, the cladding on the front elevation is already in place and covers the upper half of this elevation, with a vertical brick pier on one side and the other side abutting the original concrete tiles on the neighbouring property, 2 Sunnyside (No.2). The ground floor elevation to the host is mainly brick. In my view, the use of the proposed grey cladding is, on balance, appropriate to the site and its setting. The previous concrete tiles, as can still be seen on No.2 and on the rear of the host, are not of any value or merit and are showing their age. This contrasts with the proposed cladding whose light grey colour integrates well with the simple and unassuming form of the host property and its modern dark coloured aluminium windows.
11. Whilst I accept that the proposed cladding has led to a change in the appearance of part of the front elevation, that change is not significant or

harmful to local character and has essentially refreshed the appearance of this part of the host. The result would be a pallet of materials that sits reasonably comfortably on the host and within the wider area.

12. The appeal site is located within part of the settlement that has no uniform or special character and where, as I observed on my site visit, materials vary from different types of brickwork, painted brickwork and white/painted render, as well as some examples of composite cladding. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the proposed cladding would have no material impact, either individually or cumulatively, on the local character or distinctiveness of this part of the Park and neither would such a modest change result in any harmful suburbanising effect or lead to the gradual erosion of the National Park's special character.
13. Whilst I have had regard to the SPD, this simply states that such cladding should be "*avoided*" where it appears overly suburban and standardised. As I have found above, the use of the proposed cladding in this instance would not give rise to any concerns in this respect. Whilst the SPD is also guidance that should be applied accordingly, having considered the individual circumstance of this case and its local context I have found the use of the proposed cladding to be acceptable in this instance. Any future proposals for similar cladding within the National Park would have to be considered on the same basis and in relation to its compliance or otherwise with the relevant policies seeking to protect the Park's distinctive character and protected landscape.
14. I find, therefore, that the appeal proposal would not lead to any significant harm to the locally distinctive character of this part of the New Forest National Park and would not lead to any harmful suburbanising effect or to the erosion of the special qualities of the National Park. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with the aims and objectives of policies DP2, SP17 and DP18 of the Local Plan or the corresponding policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) (July 2021), and neither would the proposal result in any material conflict with the aims and objectives of paragraph 5.22 of the SPD.

Conditions

15. In line with the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions, conditions requiring compliance with the submitted plans and for materials to be in accordance with those shown in the Application Form, are necessary and reasonable to reflect the details included within the application and to ensure a high quality of design. I have, however, added a list of approved plans for clarity.

Conclusion

16. 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