

Application Number: 16/11425 Full Planning Permission

Site: GOBLINS GREEN, SALISBURY ROAD, BLASHFORD,
ELLINGHAM HARBRIDGE & IBSLEY BH24 3PF

Development: Two-storey side extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Dimmer

Target Date: 12/12/2016

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Parish Council view

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Constraints

Flood Zone
Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone
Plan Area
Planning Agreement

Plan Policy Designations

Countryside

National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF Ch. 7 - Requiring good design
NPPF Ch. 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Core Strategy

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

Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document

DM2: Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity

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
16/10862 Two-storey side extension	22/08/2016	Refused	Decided	
83/NFDC/24532 Erection of an attached garage and store (existing garage and store to be demolished).	19/07/1983	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided	
XX/RFR/16170 Alterations and extensions	16/05/1973	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided	

5 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

No comments received

6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council: recommend permission under option 3 to NFDC, with the following comments:-

- The unsympathetic extensions added in the 50s and 70s have resulted in the original cottage being rather overwhelmed. The Parish Council feel that this proposal is the best fit if the applicant wishes to retain the original central section of the cottage.
- The materials to be used must match the existing white smooth render with matching roof tiles.
- Any future application for a garage will be regarded unfavourably.

7 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Natural England: no objection

NPA Ecologist: no objections. The position of the building is conducive to the presence of bats. Given the scale of the works and that there are no records for the property, the risk of impacts is reduced and therefore, in this instance refusal on the basis of lack of information would not be justified. However, it is recommended that the applicant is made aware of the potential for protected species on the site and the need for precaution. An informative note is suggested.

Comments in full are available on our website.

8 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

One letter of support:

- property set back from road, and not visible;

- closest neighbours to property, no objections to extension, and will improve look of property;
- it is in keeping with the remainder of properties and the general area

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.

This application was a resubmission following a previous refusal, 16/10862. Even though the size of the extension has been slightly reduced to overcome the policy objection, the height and form of the extension would still appear unsympathetic to the existing dwelling which would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the character of the property and its rural location. These concerns were identified in the determination of the previous planning application as well as in the initial briefing on this application, but have not been addressed. Furthermore, no pre-application advice was sought prior to the new application being submitted. As the application now falls to be determined, there would be a sufficient level of harm arising from this proposal to justify a refusal in this instance.

12 ASSESSMENT

- 12.1 The property occupies an isolated position, accessed by an unmade track. By reason of its location, the proposed extension would not impact on neighbour amenity or on the street scene.
- 12.2 A previous application, for a similar proposal, was refused for two reasons. Firstly as due to its height and gabled form it would be an overly dominant and unsympathetic extension that would overwhelm the original cottage, and would result in a harmful form of development that would detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its countryside location
- 12.3 Secondly, due to its size in relation to the original dwelling it would be contrary to policy DM20.

- 12.4 The modest reduction in the overall dimensions of the proposed extension has resulted in the floorspace falling within the 30% allowance of policy DM20, so that the proposed extension now complies with policy.
- 12.5 The remaining consideration in assessing this proposal is its impact on the character of the existing dwelling, and rural location.
- 12.6 The existing dwelling has been extended in the past, and this is identifiable on site, the smaller two storey element being the original dwelling. A two storey side extension was added c 1973, and even though this dominates the original dwelling, the front elevation of the extension reflected the form of that property.
- 12.7 The proposed two storey extension would replace the existing attached single storey garage. The introduction of a full gable within the front elevation would not be sympathetic to the form of the extended dwelling and, coupled with the proposed height of the extension when comparable to the previous extension, would result in an overly dominant element that erodes the form of the original dwelling. It would therefore adversely impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
- 12.8 The harm of this form of extension was identified in the previous application, and formed one of the reasons for refusal. No attempt has been made to address the earlier reason for refusal, and alternative options to extend the dwelling have not been explored. Even though the property is in an isolated location it is located on the route of public footpath 727. This unsympathetic addition would result in a more imposing building which would be at odds in this sensitive rural location and the use of matching materials would not be sufficient to mitigate the harm of the extension. As such for the reasons set out above, there would be a justifiable level of harm arising from this proposal to justify a refusal in this instance.
- 12.9 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.

13. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. By reason of the height and gabled form of the proposed extension, this would result in an overly dominant and unsympathetic addition that would overwhelm the original cottage. As such it would result in a harmful form of development that would detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its countryside location, contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, DM20 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Development Plan, and Chap 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

This application was a resubmission following a previous refusal. Even though the size of the extension had been slightly reduced to overcome the policy objection, the height and form of the extension would still be unsympathetic to the existing dwelling which would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the character of the property and its rural location. These concerns were identified in the determination of the previous planning application as well as in the initial briefing on this application. No attempt has been made to address this aspect of the refusal and furthermore no advice was sought prior to the new application being submitted. There would be a sufficient level of harm arising from this proposal with regards to the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its rural location, to justify a refusal in this instance.

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**
January 2017

Item No: 3c
Goblins Green
Salisbury Road
Blashford EH1
16/11425
SU1407

Scale 1:2500

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

