

Application Number: 16/11371 Full Planning Permission

Site: POUND COTTAGE, HIGH STREET, NORTH END,
DAMERHAM. SP6 3HA

Development: Single-storey extensions; porch; bay window extension

Applicant: Mr Flood

Target Date: 30/11/2016

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary Parish Council view

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Constraints

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

Conservation Area: Damerham Conservation Area
Listed Building Grade: Grade II

Plan Policy Designations

Countryside

National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF Ch. 7 - Requiring good design
NPPF Ch. 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Core Strategy

CS2: Design quality
CS3: Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation)
CS6: Flood risk
CS10: The spatial strategy

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

Proposal	Decision Date	Decision Description	Status	Appeal Description
13/10781 Conservatory; relocate access & gates (Application for Listed Building Consent)	02/09/2013	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided	
13/10782 Conservatory; relocate access & gates	02/09/2013	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided	
12/98551 Conservatory; relocate access & gates	13/07/2012	Refused	Appeal Decided	Appeal Dismissed
12/98568 Conservatory; relocate access & gates (Application for Listed Building Consent)	13/07/2012	Refused	Appeal Decided	Appeal Dismissed
86/NFDC/33666/LBC Kitchen utility room and lobby with bathroom and study over.	11/03/1987	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided	
86/NFDC/33665 Kitchen utility room and lobby with bathroom and study over.	26/02/1987	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided	
86/NFDC/31856 Addition of a kitchen and utility room with bedroom over (demolition of shed).	13/06/1986	Refused	Decided	Appeal Allowed
85/NFDC/30854 Addition of kitchen, utility room and larder with bedroom over. (Demolition of shed).	12/06/1986	Refused	Decided	Appeal Allowed
85/NFDC/30391 Addition of kitchen, utility room and larder with bedroom over (existing lean-to shed to be demolished).	13/01/1986	Refused	Decided	

5 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

No Comments Received

6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Damerham Parish Council: recommend permission.

Councillors believed that the plans would lead to an aesthetic improvement to the building and therefore had no objections to put forward. Three main points were made:

1. There is already an existing planning application approved that grants a similar expansion but to a different part of the building. The owners are only seeking to have this expansion elsewhere on the building.
2. The Council was advised that the new location was recommended by the Conservation Officer when visiting the site for the original application as they felt it would look better sited as per the new application.
3. The alterations are to a newer part of the building and are shielded from the road by the rest of the house.

7 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Conservation Officer: recommends refusal. Concerns raised over the proposed design of the extensions. The extension on the north-east side of the property would result in a confusing and contrived roof form, with unresolved elements. The bay on the elevation would respond poorly to the otherwise traditional appearance of this elevation of the building. This would lead to harm to the significance of this heritage asset.

Natural England: comment Only

Environment Agency: no comments received

Comments in full are available on website.

8 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

No Comments Received

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.

The applicant sought pre-application advice from the Council during which concerns were expressed over elements of the scheme. Not all of these concerns have been addressed through this current submission and this has been discussed with the applicant. On the basis of these concerns the application cannot be supported.

12 ASSESSMENT

- 12.1 Pound Cottage is a Grade II Listed Building located in the Damerham Conservation Area within the countryside and designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It sits in generous grounds which include a detached barn building which is subject to a separate listing. The property and adjacent barn originally date from the 18th Century, the property has however been subject to 20th Century additions with a two-storey and single-storey additions on its north-east side which replaced a former lean-to structure. There is also an extant consent for the addition of a conservatory on the north-west elevation which was approved in conjunction with revised access arrangements, subsequently implemented.
- 12.2 These proposals would see the removal of the existing lean-to utility room and the addition of an enlarged single storey addition which would provide space for conservatory, utility and W.C. The design would incorporate a lean-to roof structure, partly glazed adjacent to the remaining building with a further flat 'green roof' roofed element with plateau roof lights. A new, largely glazed bay with access doors is also proposed on the south-east elevation, in lieu of a current window opening which would also incorporate a flat 'green roof'. A new porch is also proposed on the north-west elevation of the building.
- 12.3 The proposals were subject to pre-application advice from the Council, as included within the applicant's supporting statement. The proposals put forward differed slightly in the inclusion of a wrap around extension on the south-east elevation of the building, now replaced by a projecting bay. However, the bulk of the extension on the north-east side of the building remains unchanged and a number of concerns were raised over the various glazed element, realisation of the green roof construction and compliance with the Council's floor space policy. It was concluded that there may be scope for an alternative light weight addition in substitution for the extant conservatory, however further consideration would need to be given to its scale and detailed design.
- 12.4 The proposals put forward under this application again raise a number of concerns over their scale, form and detailed design. Although it is recognised the alterations will have no harmful impact on the building's historic fabric affecting modern elements, nonetheless they will impact on its appearance and wider setting within the Conservation Area. When considering any additions to historic buildings these need to sympathetically respond to their significance, character and appearance, representing a natural progression of the building.

- 12.5 The proposed extension on the north east of the building would incorporate mixture of roof styles which in combination, provide a disjointed and contrived design that does not relate sympathetically to the otherwise traditional and simple form of the building. There are also concerns over the realisation of the green roof and the appropriateness of this design approach. Although no large scale details accompany this application, the depth of the roof structure would be substantial and result in a top heavy appearance. This would appear uncomfortable against the slimmer proportions reflective of a more contemporary light weight design which is being sought in this instance. Furthermore nature of green roof construction is such that the planted material would disguise the recessed tray and roof light projections. However, should this be removed the long term visual impacts of the roof structure would be unsightly and not reflect the design quality expected for this heritage asset.
- 12.6 The new bay on the south-east elevation would see alterations to an existing opening on a 20th Century part of the building. This said the current opening and indeed these former extensions to the building in their form and design closely emulate the style and appearance of the historic elements of the building. The proposed new bay would introduce a large, modern feature opening which would respond poorly to the established window to wall ratio of this elevation and would appear discordant against its otherwise traditional appearance and the design principles of this former extension. Furthermore there are again concerns over the appropriateness of the green roof and the resulting visual impacts of its detailing. Although following repositioning of the vehicular access to the property this may be a less conspicuous elevation of the building, public visibility is not the only consideration. It is also noted that this was most likely the original principle elevation of the building and as such alterations would have a potentially more damaging impact on the buildings significance. In respect of the proposed new porch addition on the building's north-west elevation this would be a modest and simple addition which would be consistent with the character of the building.
- 12.7 In respect of the overall proportionate increase in the size of the property it is noted that the former extensions have already exceeded the 30% limitation under Policy DM20. The existing floor space as on 1st July 1982 of 113.51 square metres and the current floor space being 149.77 square metres, a 32% increase has already occurred. This proposal would see the addition of further floor space, totalling 163.21 square metres, representing a 44% increase. Although the proposals included partially glazed roof and wall areas this does not meet with the definition of a conservatory as clarified within the Local Plan document, as less than three quarters of the roof area is made of translucent material. Furthermore with reference to the spirit of the policy this is intended to permit separate 'light weight' additions, of which the proposed "conservatory" as a result of its heavy roof design and integration as part of the new extension, would not be representative. Although reference is made within the applicant's supporting statement to the independent heating serving the "conservatory" and doorway separation from the main accommodation, this is not a requirement of the relevant local plan policy. It is also noted that when applying this flexibility to the policy in the case of conservatories, regard also needs to be had to the impact of the proposal on the setting of the dwelling and character of the area. For the reasons discussed above it is not considered that the proposal would

meet with these requirements in any case. Exemption can also be made under the policy where this would meet the design considerations relating to the special character of a building. However again, the design is not considered appropriate in this instance and no argument on these grounds to justify the necessity for these further additions has been put forward in this case.

- 12.8 Mindful of the extant consent for the addition of a conservatory any further additions would need to be on the basis that this former consent was not implemented. The cumulative impacts of such an eventuality would cumulatively erode the significance of the building. This could be overcome through a legal agreement entered into by the applicants precluding the implementation of the former consent. However, in this instance as the proposals are not considered to be of an appropriate design, no legal agreement has been sought at this stage. Furthermore in this case, the fall back position of the previously approved conservatory being implemented is seen as less harmful and preferable to the development of the currently proposed extension.
- 12.9 Given the separation from neighbouring premises the proposals would not result in any harmful impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The site is close to an existing watercourse however the site of the proposed extension does not fall within the flood risk zones. The Environment Agency have been consulted however to date no comment has been received.
- 12.10 On the basis of the above as a result of their design and detailing it is considered that the proposals would be unsympathetic to the appearance of this heritage asset resulting in harm to its significance. Furthermore this would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or setting of the adjacent historic barn. The proportionate increase in floor space would also be excessive and contrary to the Local Plan objectives for minimising the impacts on development on the countryside and safeguarding its future by maintaining a varied housing stock in rural area. As such the refusal of this application is recommended.
- 12.11 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.

13. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The combination of different roof designs of the north-east side extension and heavy and unresolved green roof design would appear contrived and unsympathetic to the otherwise simple, period appearance and form of this 18th Century farmhouse. Furthermore the bay on the south-east elevation would respond poorly to the established window to wall ratio and appear conspicuous on this otherwise traditional elevation. As a consequent of their design these proposal would result in harm to the appearance and significance of this heritage asset and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, or respect the setting of the adjacent listed barn building. 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. In order to safeguard the long term future of the countryside, the Local Planning Authority considers it important to resist the cumulative affect of significant enlargements being made to rural dwellings. Consequently Policy DM20 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Plan seeks to limit the proportional increase in the size of such dwellings recognising the benefits this would have in minimising the impact of buildings and human activity generally in the countryside and the ability to maintain a balance in the housing stock. This proposal would result in a building which is unacceptably large in relation to the original dwelling and would undesirably add to pressures for change which are damaging to the future of the countryside and contrary to Policy DM20 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Plan, Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.

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.

The applicant sought pre-application advice from the Council during which concerns were expressed over elements of the scheme. Not all of these concerns have been addressed through this current submission and this has been discussed with the applicant. On the basis of these concerns the application cannot be supported.

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
December 2016**

Item No: 3n & 3o

Pound Cottage
High Street
North End Damerham
16/11371 & 16/11372
SU0916

Scale 1:1250

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

