Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2026 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6011329
Hincheslea House, Tracks in Hincheslea, Hincheslea, Brockenhurst, Hampshire SO42 7UP

- 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 Paul Street against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
- The application Ref is 25/01466FULL
- The development proposed is described as “balcony”.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure & Preliminary Matters

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

3. Notwithstanding the above description, which is from the application form, the scheme also includes adding a new window in the first floor of the front elevation above the cart entrance, two in the ground floor rear elevation flanking a door that would be changed from a window and changing three windows for French style double doors on the rear. One set leading onto the balcony and the other two out from the ground floor underneath it. I have considered the works in their entirety, as did the Council in their evidence.

4. Having reviewed the most recent changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), I am satisfied that they do not affect the substance of the main issues or the outcome of the appeal. Since arguments would not therefore be prejudiced, I have proceeded without further consultation with the main parties

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) and the New Forest National Park (NP).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal building is a former coach house and stable. It is currently used for purposes ancillary to the main dwelling, which itself is a replacement of a listed country house that was lost to fire and de listed in the late 1980s. Whist not having any formal designation as being curtilage listed, the building is a NDHA.

7. It is a fine example of its type despite its current use and later extension. There is a utilitarian and traditional simplicity to its form and detailing which includes, but is not limited to, timber three over three vertically sliding sash windows with subtle arched headers in a low ratio to the amount of brick; a large central and still clearly legible cart entrance (now glazed); and a fully hipped and slate roof with an uninterrupted eaves. The appeal building therefore has notable architectural value. It also serves as a surviving example of a building providing a function to an historic manor house, positioned on the entrance thereto. The retention of much of its original character and simplicity allows its history and function to be clearly read and appreciated as, in this case typically, a cart shed and stabling to the ground floor and likely accommodation to the first. Taken together, these factors contribute positively to the significance of the building.

8. The addition of the balcony, the three sets of French style doors and the small new gable, along with the number of new windows, would overly domesticate the building, significantly changing the window to brick ratio in the former's favour, and unacceptably eroding the quality of its traditional utilitarian design. The balcony particularly, whilst modest in its own size in the context of the building and despite being finished in skeletal wrought ironwork and using glass to retain appreciation of the building's exterior, would be prominent and detract from the simplicity of the buildings form.

9. Despite them being in two cases attached to a later flat roofed extension, the French doors are an overtly modern feature that would further dilute the legible historic function and detail of the appeal building, competing visually with the original larger cart opening on the front. Whilst a traditional design approach generally speaking, the insertion of the new gable would interrupt the original roof's shape, introducing an unwelcome verticality to the full hip. It would frame, draw attention to and thus highlight the incongruity of the French style doors it would facilitate the insertion of.

10. Whilst some changes have been made to a previously resisted scheme, for the reasons set out they have not gone far enough to make the current proposals acceptable. One example of a gablet roof has been provided to support this scheme. However, I have no indication of when this form was introduced or whether it is an original feature. I am unaware of the wider character including the host dwelling this building serves. The presence of one example does not automatically suggest the acceptability for this scheme. The appellant has discounted alternative locations for the balcony in terms of their unsuitability; but my recommendation is based on the proposals before me and not other speculative schemes. That is for the main parties to discuss outside of the appeal process.

11. Taken together, the above matters would cause unacceptable harm to the significance of the NDHA. Policy HE7 of the Framework advises that where this is the case, this should be weighed against the benefits and a balanced judgement made. There would be some related to the works in terms of them generating employment and investment into the local economy, but this would be time limited. The scheme would facilitate improvements to the building's usability, but this would be privately beneficial. No other benefits have been identified. Collectively, I would apportion them very limited weight. They would thus be incapable of outweighing the enduring harms I have found to the significance of the NDHA.

12. I am aware of the duty to further the purposes of protected landscapes. For the NP, these are conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage; and, promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the NP by the public. Despite how exposed the building is in local landscape terms, it sits within the residential curtilage and is relatively secluded in the wider sense. The scheme would extend an existing annexe in a limited fashion land take wise and maintain its relationship to the land on which it sits. Given this, it would conserve the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the NP.

13. Nevertheless, and with the above in mind, there would be conflict with Policies DP2, DP18 and SP16 of the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016, the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework 2026 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2022. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard and protect the historic environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The appeal scheme would extend and alter an existing building outside of a settlement. Such should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework. It is sufficiently clear that, given the amount of unacceptable interruption there would be to the quality of the appeal building, how this would then not satisfy the tests of the historic environment decision making policies of the Framework, this would be the case when factored against the very limited range of benefits there would be arising. Policy S5 of the Framework does not therefore indicate that permission should be granted.

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced and the approach of the Framework, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR