

Application Number: 16/11553 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: 04/01/2017

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

At the request of a member of the Committee

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Constraints

Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone
Plan Area

Plan Policy Designations

Built-up Area

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7

Core Strategy

CS2: Design quality

Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document

None relevant

Supplementary Planning Guidance And Documents

SPD - Ringwood Local Distinctiveness

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
16/10360 Raise ridge height in association with new first floor; two-storey front and rear extensions; solar panels	08/06/2016	Refused	Decided

12/98477 Single-storey rear extension; roof alterations; dormers & rooflights in association with new first floor	28/05/2012	Refused	Decided
11/97043 Single-storey rear extension; roof alterations, dormers and rooflights in association with new first floor	06/06/2011	Refused	Decided
XX/RFR/03277 Bungalow with access.	17/10/1955	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided

5 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

Cllr Thierry requests that the application be determined by the Planning Development Control Committee.

6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

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

7 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

No comments received

8 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Total Number of Representations Received: 3

1 objection on grounds of: (summary)

- inappropriate design and out of character

2 in support on grounds of: (summary)

- appropriate design and reflects other development permitted in the vicinity
- the development would enable the creation of a modern family home

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.

In this case the applicants sought pre-application advice from the Council, following the previous refusal. Aspects of this advice are reflected in this submission however it does not fully address the concerns raised at pre-application stage and as such the application does not overcome the previous reason for refusal and cannot be supported.

12 ASSESSMENT

12.1 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.

12.2 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 0.8m. Solar panels are also proposed.

12.3 This application follows a previously refused application under reference 16/10360 which was refused for the following reasons:

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).

12.4 The comparative design changes made have seen a narrowing of the principle gable width by 1.2m, reduction in the maximum height of the building, a cropped gable roof form on the front elevation and reduction in the number of first floor front elevation windows

12.5 Concerns over the previously refused application centred on the increased span of the property and full gable roof form, which was considered to relate poorly to the established form and spatial characteristics of built development in this row. With reference to the streetscene along this stretch of Highfield Avenue it was noted that where some of the original bungalow style properties have seen roof alterations these have retained the property's original span. This has maintained the spatial relationships in the relative proportions of space to built form, reinforcing a rhythm to the appearance of the street scene and

established the spatial characteristic of its development. Furthermore this style of design in these cases provides a sense of related cohesion to the appearance of this group.

- 12.6 It is recognised that the design changes made by the inclusion of a cropped roof form, fenestration reduction and more limited increase in the span of the property offer improvements over the previously refused scheme. However it is also noted that the span of the property would still be increased by 1.7m. Although this is not such an extent of increase as originally proposed, nonetheless this would be significant in context. As demonstrated in the illustrative street scene submitted by the applicant, the resulting width of the property and shallow roof pitch would appear disproportionate and the resulting gable front appear overly large in context with other related development in this group. The increased principle span of the property would be a defining and influential feature of the proposed design, such that design adjustments to the roof form and fenestration do not overcome this fundamental issue with the proposed developments appearance.
- 12.7 It is noted that the applicants sought pre-application advice from the Council, following the previous refusal. Aspects of this advice, in the retention of a lower eaves height, reduction to a single front gable window and cropping of the front roof form are reflected in this submission. However, it was advised that with the proposed 1.2m reduction in the span of the proposed gable it would still be overly wide. This has not been further reduced as part of this current application submission.
- 12.8 The applicant has submitted a supporting statement which includes examples of development in the vicinity of the site. However in these cases the streetscene context differs such that direct comparison cannot be drawn to this case.
- 12.9 On the basis of the above it is considered that as a result of its increase in width the proposed development in its roof form would again appear overly large and conspicuous. This would relate poorly to the established appearance of development and spatial characteristics of the built development in this row, leading to a visually intrusive development that would not promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
- 12.10 The proposal would lead to some additional overshadowing of adjacent neighbouring premises 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.
- 12.11 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.

12.12 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 proposed alterations as a result of the roof design in its span would appear overly wide and disproportionate, relating poorly to the appearance and established spatial characteristics of development in this row. This would introduce a visually intrusive form of development that would be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene and would not promote or reinforce local distinctiveness, in conflict with 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 sought pre-application advice from the Council, following the previous refusal. Aspects of this advice are reflected in this submission however it does not fully address the concerns raised at pre-application stage and as such the application does not overcome the previous reason for refusal and could not 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**
February 2017

Item No: 3j

6
Highfield Avenue
Ringwood
16/11553
SU1505

Scale 1:1250

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



© Crown copyright and database rights 2017 Ordnance Survey 100026220