

**Application Number:** 16/10360 Full Planning Permission

**Site:** 6 HIGHFIELD AVENUE, RINGWOOD BH24 1RH

**Development:** Raise ridge height in association with new first floor; two-storey front and rear extensions; solar panels

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Khan

**Target Date:** 18/05/2016

**1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

Request of Member of the Committee

**2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS**

Built up area

**3 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES**

**Core Strategy**

Objectives

- 1. Special qualities, local distinctiveness and a high quality living environment
- 6. Towns, villages and built environment quality

Policies

CS2: Design quality

**Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document**

None relevant

**4 RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT ADVICE**

Section 38 Development Plan  
 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004  
 National Planning Policy Framework

**5 RELEVANT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE AND DOCUMENTS**

Ringwood Local Distinctiveness

**6 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 12/98477 Single-storey rear extension; roof alterations; dormers & rooflights in association with new first floor 28/05/2012 Refused
- 11/97043 Single-storey rear extension; roof alterations, dormers and rooflights in association with new first floor 06/06/2011 Refused

## **7 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Ringwood Town Council - Recommend permission but would accept the decision reached by the DC Officers under their delegated powers.

## **8 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS**

Cllr Thierry - Requests that this application be determined by the Planning Development Control Committee.

## **9 CONSULTEE COMMENTS**

Land Drainage: No comment

## **10 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

Five representations have been received in support of the proposal for the following reasons;

- It would not be out of keeping in an area which has seen a lot of redevelopment, including larger developments and this proposal will enhance the area
- The proposal will benefit the family's quality of life

## **11 CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

None

## **12 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

From the 6 April 2015 New Forest District Council began charging the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on new residential developments.

Regulation 42 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) states that CIL will be applicable to all applications over 100sqm GIA and those that create a new dwelling. The development is under 100 sq metres and is not for a new dwelling and so there is no CIL liability in this case.

## **13 WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT/AGENT**

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, New Forest District Council take a positive and proactive approach, seeking solutions to any problems arising in the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome.

This is achieved by

- Strongly encouraging those proposing development to use the very thorough pre application advice service the Council provides.
- Working together with applicants/agents to ensure planning applications are registered as expeditiously as possible.
- Advising agents/applicants early on in the processing of an application (through the release of a Parish Briefing Note) as to the key issues relevant to the application.

- Updating applicants/agents of issues that arise in the processing of their applications through the availability of comments received on the web or by direct contact when relevant.
- Working together with applicants/agents to closely manage the planning application process to allow an opportunity to negotiate and accept amendments on applications (particularly those that best support the Core Strategy Objectives) when this can be done without compromising government performance requirements.
- Advising applicants/agents as soon as possible as to concerns that cannot be dealt with during the processing of an application allowing for a timely withdrawal and re-submission or decision based on the scheme as originally submitted if this is what the applicant/agent requires.
- When necessary discussing with applicants/agents proposed conditions especially those that would restrict the use of commercial properties or land when this can be done without compromising government performance requirements.

In this case the applicants did not seek pre-application advice from the Council. The applicant has been made aware of the Council's concerns and that these could not be overcome through amended plans under the scope of this submission.

## **14 ASSESSMENT**

- 14.1 The site is located within an established residential area of Ringwood. This is a detached bungalow externally clad in render under a plain tiled roof. It has a flat roofed garage projection on its southern side and a small glazed lean-to extension at the rear. Neighbouring properties are on both sides of the site and to the rear along Highfield Drive.
- 14.2 This application proposes to extend the property at the front and rear, and to replace the existing roof to encompass these additions under a simplified structure while providing first floor accommodation. This would see a change in roof form and increase in height of approximately 1m. Solar panels are also proposed. This application follows previous schemes for roof alterations submitted in 2001 and 2012, which were refused for reason of their impacts on the appearance of the street scene and impacts on neighbouring occupiers. It is however noted that this proposal differs significantly in its form and design.
- 14.3 The streetscene along this stretch of Highfield Avenue is characterised by bungalow style development, however most have been subject to alterations from their original form. This has seen properties extended at ground floor level and also subject to roof alterations to create first floor accommodation.
- 14.4 Given that other properties in this row have seen roof alterations with increases in height and roof form, there is no in-principle objection to the intentions of this proposal. However, it is where these neighbouring properties have increased in height the new roof forms have retained the property's original span. This has maintained relationships between them in the relative proportions of space to built form and reinforced the rhythm to the appearance of the street scene and established the spatial characteristic of its development.

- 14.5 This proposal would see an increase in the principle span of the property such that would see it fill almost the full width of the plot. In comparison with other dwellings in this row this would appear overly wide and the encroachment across the plot would relate poorly to the established spatial characteristics. Furthermore, the proposed large, full gable design against a streetscene of hipped and cropped roof forms together with the proposed pair of first floor windows would act to accentuate its conspicuousness. On this basis it is considered that the proposal would relate poorly to the established character and form of development, resulting in harm to visual amenity and the appearance of the street scene.
- 14.6 The applicant has submitted a supporting statement which includes a street scene, examples of other integrated garages near to the site and gables fronting Highfield Avenue. In respect of the street scene drawing, it is considered this demonstrates the inappropriateness of the proposed span of the dwelling in comparison with others on this row. Furthermore, the other integrated garages differ significantly in their streetscene context and it is not the principle of incorporating the garage that is of concern, but the external expression of this in the design proposed. The examples of fully gabled roof forms relate to subservient single storey elements of the properties shown. That at two storey height, No 1 Highfield Avenue, is on the opposite side of the road at the junction with Farm Close. This is a corner plot property which stands alone between the planned development along Orchard Close and Farm Close and its appearance is not out of keeping with the two storey development at Farm Close against which it viewed in the street scene.
- 14.7 The proposal would lead to some additional overshadowing of adjacent neighbouring premise and the presence of existing side windows in these properties is noted. However given the proposed roof design and relative scale of the proposals it is not considered that this would lead to demonstrable harm through loss of light.
- 14.8 New first floor side window openings would face towards neighbouring premises. However, a condition restricting glazing could be used to mitigated any potential loss of privacy. The rear elevation full height glazed opening would direct views to the rear of the site and views towards neighbouring premises would be oblique or distant. Given the limited aspect of these views it is not considered that they would lead to any harmful loss of privacy and would be reflective of relationships that could reasonably be expected in such established residential areas.
- 14.9 In coming to this recommendation, consideration has been given to the rights set out in Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions) of the European Convention on Human Rights. Whilst it is recognised that this recommendation, if agreed, may interfere with the rights and freedoms of the applicant to develop the land in the way proposed, the objections to the planning application are serious ones and cannot be overcome by the imposition of conditions. The public interest and the rights and freedoms of neighbouring property owners can only be safeguarded by the refusal of permission.

## 15. RECOMMENDATION

### Refuse

#### Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed alterations, as a result of the roof design with its overly wide span and full gable design, would relate poorly to the established appearance of development which has hipped roof forms, and the spatial characteristics of the built development in this row. This would result in a visually conspicuous form of development, harmful to visual amenity and the appearance of the street scene. As such this would be contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and guidance within the Ringwood Local Distinctiveness SPD (2013).

#### Notes for inclusion on certificate:

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, New Forest District Council takes a positive and proactive approach, seeking solutions to any problems arising in the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome by giving clear advice to applicants.

In this case the applicants did not seek pre-application advice from the Council. The applicant has been made aware of the Council's concerns and these could not be overcome through amended plans under the scope of this submission.

2. This decision relates to additional plans received by the Local Planning Authority on 04.05.16

#### Further Information:

Householder Team

Telephone: 023 8028 5345 (Option 1)



**New Forest**  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Tel: 023 8028 5000  
www.newforest.gov.uk

David Groom  
Service Manager  
Planning and Building Control  
New Forest District Council  
Appletree Court  
Lynchurst  
SO43 7PA

**Planning Development  
Control Committee**  
June 2016

**Item No: 3d**  
6

Highfield Avenue  
Ringwood  
16/10360  
SU1505

Scale 1:1250

N.B. If printing this plan from  
the internet, it will not be to  
scale.

