



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2026

by **R Cahalane BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005545

Moorview Cottage, Winsor Road, Winsor, Hampshire SO40 2HP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Steven & Kenzie Waters against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is 25/01327FULL.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extensions and replacement porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extensions and replacement porch at Moorview Cottage, Winsor Road, Winsor, Hampshire SO40 2HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01327FULL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 1-SKW-25-A; and 2-SKW-25-A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling (Moorview Cottage) as a non-designated heritage asset, and the Forest North East Conservation Area; and
 - the effect on the landscape and scenic beauty of the New Forest National Park, including tranquillity.

Reasons

Moorview Cottage and the Forest North East Conservation Area (CA)

3. Moorview Cottage is a detached two-storey red brick cottage-style dwelling, understood to date from the early 20th century. It is within the CA which encapsulates a large area across open countryside and linear settlements. The CA is divided in to seven character areas, as set out in the National Park Authority's (NPA's) Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CA Character Appraisal) (printed March 2009). Moorview Cottage lies within character area B (Winsor).

4. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Having regard to the CA Character Appraisal and my own observations on site, the significance of character area B (Winsor), and the CA as a whole, is derived in part from its modest thatched and red brick cottages in an historic linear form, with views of mature trees and open land beyond.
5. Moorview Cottage has some period features, including two brick chimney stacks, sash windows and decorative window headers. Its original form appears to be very similar to that of Inglenook Cottage alongside it, and it sits within a row of cottages with many notable historic features. Overall, it therefore contributes positively to the significance of the CA, even though it has already been extended. I therefore agree with the NPA that Moorview Cottage is of sufficient local historic interest to be considered a non-designated heritage asset.
6. The existing single-storey side extension, sought to be replaced by the proposed two-storey side extension, is of no historical merit. Given its front casement window and wide monopitch gable flush to the original front elevation, it appears at odds with the historic characteristics of the cottage, despite its single storey form. It therefore forms a negative contribution to the CA's significance.
7. From the existing front elevation, the set-back distance of the proposed two storey side extension would not be significant, neither would the slightly lower ridge height from the existing main ridge. This would nonetheless allow the proposal to be read as an honest standalone extension to the original dwelling.
8. Any side extension would inevitably unbalance the original frontage. The two-storey scale would not of itself be subservient. However, the replacement side extension would be noticeably more set in from the side boundary when compared to the wider extension in which it would replace. Its width would be significantly less than that of the original dwelling, and the front window design, size and positioning would also match the existing. I also saw some other examples of appropriately designed side extensions within the abovementioned row of cottages. This extension would therefore not appear visually incohesive in this context.
9. This side addition would necessitate removal of one of the chimneys. However, I noted during my site visit that some of its brickwork was clearly deteriorating. It also does not possess the noticeably more ornate brick detailing displayed on the chimney on the other side of Moorview Cottage to be retained. The proposal would thus not amount to loss of historic fabric of particular significance in this regard.
10. The chimney to be retained is of very similar positioning and design as the single chimney of Inglenook Cottage, which would provide an element of symmetry in the roofscapes. In all above respects, the local character and distinctiveness of Moorview Cottage and the CA would be enhanced by the proposed replacement side extension, to a minor degree.
11. Also proposed for removal, the rear conservatory is also of no historical merit given its glazed UPVC form. Given its modest scale, almost entirely obscured from views along Winsor Road, it forms a neutral contribution to the CA's significance. The proposed extensions behind the existing inset rear elevations would not be subservient in terms of the overall additional scale and bulk. They would not

however project beyond the existing two storey rear outshot, and there are also other nearby examples of two storey rear extensions.

12. The extent of proposed rear glazing would depart from the existing fenestration of Moorview Cottage. This would not however be visible from public vantage points along Winsor Road, nor would the glazed areas be overly large in comparison to the neighbouring extensions visible immediately to each side. The above context would avoid an incongruous impact, and a planning condition can ensure that matching external materials are used.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the overall proposed extensions would not harm the character and appearance of Moorview Cottage as a non-designated heritage asset. The appeal scheme would also not harm the character, appearance and significance of the CA.
14. Thus, I have found no conflict with Policies DP2, DP18 and SP16 of the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016-2036 (LP) (adopted 2019). Collectively, these policies require, amongst other things, proposals to protect locally important sites and features of the historic and built environment, be appropriate and sympathetic in terms of scale, appearance, form, siting and layout, and context, and to not harm key visual features. In turn, I have found no conflict with the relevant guidance within the NPA's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2022).

New Forest National Park (NFNP)

15. As set out in the LP, the special qualities of the NFNP that I consider relevant to the appeal proposal are its historic heritage, and its tranquillity in the midst of the busy, built-up south of England. In the first main issue above, I have already found that the proposal would not harm historic heritage.
16. The proposed extensions would include a considerably greater amount of glazing across the rear elevations than existing. Whilst there is a large expanse of undeveloped land beyond the appeal site's rear boundary, its rear garden is deep and thus provides a good level of separation between the dwelling and the wider undeveloped land. Moorview Cottage also forms part of a long row of residences. During my visit, I noted that the dwellings to each side have been extended to the rear and include sizeable first floor rear elevation glazing.
17. Given the above context, I do not envisage that the proposed rear glazing, including the first-floor apex glazed bedroom window, would harm the tranquillity of the countryside beyond, including its dark skies. I therefore conclude that the overall proposal would not harm the landscape and scenic beauty of the NFNP, including in terms of tranquillity.
18. The appeal scheme thus complies with LP Policy SP15. This policy requires, amongst other things, new development to avoid visual intrusion on the NFNP and its special qualities, including prevention of artificial lighting from eroding rural darkness and tranquillity.

Other Matter

19. The NPA's evidence indicates no objection in respect of the proposed replacement front porch. Following my site visit, noting other similar examples in the vicinity, I have no reason to disagree.

Conditions

20. Condition 1 is necessary in the interests of planning certainty. Condition 2 is necessary to clarify the approved plan details. A condition requiring the external materials to match those of the existing dwelling (condition 3) is necessary, in the interests of the significance of the FNECA.

Conclusion

21. The first statutory purpose of National Parks (NP) is to conserve and enhance their natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. The second statutory purpose is to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the NP by the public. Section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 strengthens the above duty on relevant authorities in respect of their functions which affect land in NPs, who now must “seek to further” their statutory purposes.
22. I have carefully considered this strengthened duty. For the above reasons, I have found that the proposal would not harm the NFNP’s special qualities relevant to the proposal. The NFNP’s natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage would be unharmed, and the development would not diminish opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the NFNP by the public.
23. Accordingly, and for the other reasons already set out above, I have found no conflict with the development plan as a whole. In such circumstances and having regard to the relevant case law, allowing this appeal would not conflict with the abovementioned strengthened duty.
24. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.

R Cahalane

INSPECTOR