

Application Number: 16/11047 Full Planning Permission

Site: HOME BAKERY COTTAGE, LOWER DAGGONS LANE,
SOUTH END, DAMERHAM SP6 3HW

Development: Two-storey and single-storey rear extensions; front porch;
detached double garage

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Lack

Target Date: 16/09/2016

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary Parish Council view

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Constraints

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone
Plan Area
Explosives Safeguarding Zone
Groundwater Protection Zone

Conservation Area: Damerham Conservation Area

Plan Policy Designations

Countryside

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7

Core Strategy

CS2: Design quality
CS3: Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation)

Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document

DM1: Heritage and Conservation
DM20: Residential development in the countryside

Supplementary Planning Guidance And Documents

SPG - Residential Design Guide for Rural Areas

3 RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT ADVICE

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

4 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

None relevant

5 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

No Comments Received

6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Damerham Parish Council

The Council discussed the objections which had been made, but were agreed that there was nothing to which they should object and that the size was modest and reasonable. It was felt that the application, if approved, would bring about significant improvements to the property which were much needed.

Recommend permission.

The Council supported the application and, should it go to committee, would attend to speak in favour. This was accepted by unanimous vote

7 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Conservation Officer

Unable to support the proposals.

The significance of the cottage and the building group within the designated heritage asset are high. The proposed extensions and garage due to their excessive bulk, scale and massing adversely impact upon this significance causing harm.

The combined impact of the additions would have an excessive length, depth and width, and as a result would detract from the original scale and form of the building creating an overbearing rear extension with further single storey additions to create a gentrifying effect. Concerns are also raised over aspects of the design detailing which would not relate well to the existing building.

The proposal details a suburban square plan garage with little harmony with its surroundings or the main cottage. This structure will be particularly visible from the street and will again begin to dominate the smaller character of the main building.

Concerns raised over the response of the proposals to the scale and character of the rural building and context of the conservation area as advised with the Council's adopted Residential Design Guide for Rural Areas, Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The significance of the cottage and the wider building group within the designated heritage asset is high. The proposed extensions and garage due to their excessive bulk, scale and massing, adversely impact upon this significance, causing harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

8 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Three letters of representation have been received. Two from South End Cottage and Rosemary Cottage raise objection to the proposal on grounds of;

- Visual impacts; overall scale and size will be out of proportion with neighbouring properties; detailed design and; light pollution from glazed roof areas
- Impacts on living conditions of neighbouring occupier at South End Cottage; noise, odour and loss of privacy

One registered support for the proposal from residents at Royal Cottage which consider the proposals would be positive in their impacts.

Comments in full are available on website.

9 CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

None Relevant

10 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.

11 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 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.

Pre-application advice was sought from the Council in 2012 on a proposal during which concerns were raised over the excessive width and depth of the extension and height and massing of the garage. Concerns raised during the processing of this application have been discussed with the applicant, however given their nature these could not be addressed though the submission of amended drawings under this current submission.

12 ASSESSMENT

- 12.1 The property is located in the countryside outside of the built up area. It is in the southern part of the Damerham Conservation Area and within the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is part of a pair of chalk cob cottages dating from the C19 which has been previously extended with a later brick built two-storey side extension with a front gable (late C19) and single-storey rear extensions with an adjacent garage. It is understood that the building has been previous uses as a bakery and post office, with an operational post box still in situ at the

front of the site. The property is a locally significant building, by reason of its traditional form and character making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Neighbouring premises include Royal Cottage detached to the north of the site and South End Cottage, attached.

- 12.2 The proposal details the replacement of the existing rear single storey extensions with two storey and single storey extensions, a new front porch and detached garage.
- 12.3 This cottage is a locally significant building by reason of its traditional form and character making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would meet with the proportional floorspace increase permitted under the local plan policy, seeing an increase in floor area of 20% the existing floor area being 153.08m² and proposed 183.56m². However, it would see the addition of significant extensions to the rear of the property as a combination of the two storey element, lean-to addition and conservatory. In their comparative length, width and depth these would create substantial bulk at the rear of the property which would be overbearing and proportionately excessive in comparison with its original modest scale. Furthermore elements of the design detailing in the variety of window forms, proposed number of roof lights and heavy verge details would not relate sympathetically to the appearance of the existing property. The extensive use of timber as a cladding would also appear uncomfortable against the brick construction of the original property. Although at the rear of the property the extensions would be read on the street scene and viewed from the public right of way to the rear of the site. It is recognised that at present the existing rear extensions do little to benefit the appearance of the building however this is not justification for permitting unsympathetic replacement extensions. It is however considered that the front porch would be a modest and acceptable addition to the building.
- 12.4 The proposed garage as a result of its scale, height, roof design and plan form would represent a bulky addition to the site that would compete with the more modest scale and character of the existing cottage. This would not compliment the appearance of this group or setting of the main property and this suburban form would not respond to the more linear form which would be more sympathetic to this rural setting and period of the original building.
- 12.5 On the basis of the above it is considered that the proposed extensions in their cumulative scale would result in overbearing additions to the rear of the property. Furthermore the garage in its design form would be out of scale with the existing cottage and be unsympathetic to this rural setting. As such the proposal would detract from the appearance of the building and that of this wider group of locally important buildings within the Conservation Area.
- 12.6 The proposed development would impact on neighbouring premises to the north and south of the site. In the case of that attached a favourable ordination would be maintained such that would not see any harm caused through loss of light. The development would impact on the outlook of these neighbouring occupiers, however given the design of the rear extensions in their recessive relationship to the site boundary it is not considered that the impacts would be harmful. New first floor

window openings would also be of such orientation that would not lead to any harmful increase in views towards this neighbouring site. In response to other matters raised in representation by this neighbouring owner this proposal should not see any activity generation which is out of keeping with the existing residential use of the site. Matters such as the utilities provision would be covered under building regulations.

- 12.7 The proposed garage in its positioning would lead to additional overshadowing of the neighbouring garden area at Royal Cottage. This said the relative extent of this is not considered such that would result in harm to the living conditions of these neighbouring occupiers. A letter of support from these occupiers has also been received.
- 12.8 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 there may be an interference with these rights and the rights of other third parties, such interference has to be balanced with the like rights of the applicant to develop the land in the way proposed. In this case it is considered that the protection of the rights and freedoms of the applicant outweigh any possible interference that may result to any third party.

13. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed rear extensions as a result of their scale would see the addition of excessive bulk to the cottage which would relate poorly to and overwhelm its original form and character. Furthermore elements of the design detailing would not relate sympathetically to the appearance of the existing property. As such this would detract from the appearance of the building and that of this wider group of locally important buildings and would result in harm to visual amenity in this rural area and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Plan and Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

2. The proposed garage as a result of its scale and design form would represent a bulky addition to the site that would compete with the more modest scale of the existing cottage and would not be sympathetic to this rural setting. As such this would detract from the appearance of the main property and the wider group of locally important buildings and would result in harm to visual amenity in this rural location and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Plan and Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

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 pre-application advice was sought from the Council which raised concerns that have not been addressed. Concerns raised over the proposal during the application process have been discussed with the applicant however these could not be addressed through the submission of amended drawings under this current submission.

2. This decision relates to amended / additional plans received by the Local Planning Authority on 02/09/2016

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
Lyndhurst
SO43 7PA

**Planning Development
Control Committee
October 2016**

Item No: 30

Home Bakery Cottage
Lower Daggons Lane
Damerham
16/11047
SU1015

Scale 1:1250

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

