Planning Development Control Committee

09 August 2017

Item 3 f

Application Number: 17/10689 Full Planning Permission

Site:

ARDEN COTTAGE, POPLAR LANE, BRANSGORE BH23 8JE

Development:

Raise ridge height, side dormers in association with new first floor

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs Marlow

Target Date:

09/08/2017

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

Case Officer:

Vivienne Baxter

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary Parish Council comment.

2 **DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES**

Constraints

Plan Area

Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance And Documents

RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT ADVICE 3

Section 38 Development Plan Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 National Planning Policy Framework Achieving Sustainable Development NPPF Ch. 7 - Requiring good design

4 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Proposal Decision Decision Status Appeal Date Description Description

XX/RFR/05618 Bungalow and garage. 15/06/1959 Granted Decided

5 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

No Comments Received

6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Bransgore Parish Council: Permission: The Parish Council considers the proposal to be acceptable.

7 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

No Comments Received

8 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Two representations of objection received from adjacent properties: Due to increase in height and large dormers the proposals would be out of keeping in the street scene, set an undesirable precedent, have an overbearing and overly dominant impact and result in overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of light to the detriment of the amenities of adjoining neighbours.

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 application was submitted without the prior benefit of pre-application advice and whilst the provision of a front door is welcomed, the increase in the bulk of the roof form and the associated appearance would require amendments not able to be fully considered within the 8 week process.

12 ASSESSMENT

- 12.1 The site lies within the built up area of Bransgore in a residential area. It is one of a row of bungalows of varying designs, many of which have been altered in the past. The other bungalows have hipped roof forms or side gables unlike the bungalow subject of this application which has a front gable. The proposal entails the provision of three bedrooms and two bathrooms at first floor level through the provision of raised eaves and a large dormer either side of the roof. Elevational alterations are also proposed to the front in order to provide a front door.
- 12.2 The row of properties within which the site sits is on land which slopes down to the west and north. This means that rear gardens are generally lower than the dwelling and the single storey property to the north has a lower slab level whilst that to the south is marginally higher. In view of these changes in level, it is possible to look over the boundary fence when using the existing side 'front' door. In visual terms, the eaves levels of the existing dwelling and its immediate neighbours are lower towards the north.
- 12.3 The provision of increased height to the eaves would be out of context in this locality in view of the predominance of bungalows and chalets with single storey eaves levels. The property would neither appear as a bungalow or a full two storey house. The large side dormers would add considerable bulk to the roof form as they would accommodate additional floor space rather than provision for head height or a window. This is exacerbated through the combining of two pitched dormers which would extend almost to the eaves resulting in a poor form of development at odds with the more discreet dormers on other properties nearby. It is considered that the proposal would have an unsympathetic relationship with the adjoining properties which would adversely affect the street scene.
- 12.4 There are no concerns with the front elevation alterations at ground floor level which would offer a benefit to the property.
- 12.5 With regard to residential amenity, the proposed front and rear facing bedrooms would not impact on neighbouring amenity. However, the increased ridge height and provision of side windows cumulatively, would have a more significant impact. The proposed bedroom window to the south would have oblique views towards the neighbouring garden and direct views into the existing kitchen window resulting in a loss of privacy to St Ives. To the north, it is noted that the adjacent property, Acorns, has a large window (towards the front) and door (towards the rear) in its side elevation together with patio doors facing the site albeit screened from the existing dwelling with a covered way linking an outbuilding to the bungalow. The increase in roof and eaves height would decrease the sunlight received by the adjacent property and the dormers would give the perception of overlooking. The additional bulk of the property would also be overbearing to Acorns.
- 12.6 In view of the concerns raised with regard to both residential and visual amenity, it is considered that permission should be refused for the alterations which would adversely affect both the character of the area and amenity levels currently enjoyed by the adjoining properties. 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 proposed increase in eaves and ridge level and provision of large side dormers, the proposal would result in an overly bulky and dominant development, unsympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, appearance and its relationship to adjoining buildings. For this reason it would be harmful to the street scene and character of the area, contrary to policy CS2 of the New Forest District Council Core Strategy.
- 2. The proposal would unacceptably impact on residential amenity resulting in visual intrusion, due to the increased height and bulk of the proposal, to both immediate neighbours and a loss of privacy, due to the proposed bedroom window, to St Ives. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy CS2 of the New Forest District Council Core Strategy.

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 application was submitted without the prior benefit of pre-application advice and whilst the provision of a front door is welcomed, the increase in the bulk of the roof form and the associated appearance would require amendments not able to be fully considered within the 8 week process.

Further Information:

Vivienne Baxter

Telephone: 023 8028 5588

