

H. GROUNDS OF APPEAL

If you have chosen the written representations procedure, your **FULL** grounds of appeal must be made, otherwise we will return the appeal form.

If you have requested a hearing or an inquiry, you do not have to provide your full grounds of appeal. You can provide only a brief outline of your grounds, but it must be sufficiently detailed and comprehensive enough to enable the LPA to prepare their case.

Refer to our booklet 'Making your planning appeal' for help.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Do you intend to submit a planning obligation (a section 106 agreement or a unilateral undertaking) with this appeal? YES NO

The appellants refute the LPA's allegations in reason for refusal no.1 (a) that the proposals would be out of context with the area as a result of the layout of the site and the associated parking and access arrangements which would have inadequate landscaping. It will be shown that the layout of the parking and access arrangements is appropriate and makes provision for sufficient landscaping to provide a setting for the development. This landscaping is provided around the parking spaces, along the driveway running between nos. 9 and 11 Mount Pleasant Lane and to the front of the proposed houses. The amount of landscaping to be provided on the site ensures that the parking and access areas will not appear cramped or harsh as the LPA allege. Furthermore, the proposed development is inward looking and does not impact on views from outside the site.

The LPA also state in reason for refusal no.1 (a) that there is a lack of space around the buildings and that the development would be out of context with the area. This is not the case. The proposals have been designed as two pairs of semi-detached houses that will be of a similar size to existing buildings in the locality. Space is provided to the front and rear of the proposed houses and in the gap between them and this layout is such that adequate space is available to ensure that the development will not appear cramped as the LPA allege. The proposals therefore comply with policies DW-E1 and BU-H1 of the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration.

The LPA allege in reason for refusal no.1 (b) that by reason of their size, scale and mass the proposed houses will result in a consolidation of built form across the site and be visually imposing in a manner that will be out of context with the surrounding residential development. The appellant strongly refutes these claims. Whilst the proposal will change the existing appearance of the site, nevertheless it will appear in keeping with the pattern and grain of other development in the locality and will not appear alien or intrusive within that broader pattern of development. The houses have been designed to reflect the character and appearance of the area. By providing two pairs of semi-detached houses, they will be of a similar footprint and massing to the existing detached houses fronting onto Mount Pleasant Lane. In addition the buildings are of a modest domestic scale and are designed with their first floor accommodation partially within the roof spaces. Accordingly the proposals reflect the grain of buildings found in the locality and will not detract from the character and appearance of the area but will be in compliance with policies DW-E1 and BU-H1 of the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration.

With regard to reason for refusal 1 (c), at the time the planning application was being considered the appellant had indicated to the LPA that they were prepared to enter into a Planning Obligation to make a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site public open space in accordance with policy DW-R3 of the adopted New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration. The appellant will enter into a Unilateral Planning Obligation in this respect and will provide the LPA and the Inspector with a signed Planning Obligation prior to the appeal hearing.