Planning Development Control Committee

11 October 2017

Item 3 d

Application Number: 17/10960 Full Planning Permission

Site:

34 ARNWOOD AVENUE, DIBDEN PURLIEU, HYTHE SO45 4HN

Development:

Single-storey front extension; roof alterations

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs Rae

Target Date:

30/08/2017

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

Case Officer:

Kate Cattermole

1 **REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

Contrary to Parish Council view

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

None relevant

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

Hythe & Dibden Parish Council: recommend PERMISSION.

7 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

No comments received

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.

No pre application advice was sought prior to the application being submitted. Concerns were raised at the initial briefing stage, but the Parish Council supports the proposal. Although the Parish Council comments have been taken into consideration, the development is judged to be sufficiently harmful to justify a refusal in this instance.

12 ASSESSMENT

12.1 The site is situated in a street of similar uniform development which remains mainly unaltered and despite the addition of side extensions, still presents a pleasant and unimposing frontage development. The proposed extension would project forward of the existing front elevation by 1.9 metres and incorporates a flat roofed porch. The main body of the

extension involves the forward projection of the existing side extension and an increase in the height of it's lean-to roof. The resulting building would have an awkward relationship with the existing building and by way of it's forward projection, inappropriate design form and height would create a visually intrusive and jarring feature in the street scene to the detriment of the character and local distinctiveness of the area.

- 12.2 Although the adjoining property, no 32, is set further forward than the dwelling on the application site, the proposed extension would be situated to the north-west and given it's orientation and the intervening neighbour's driveway, would not result in any harmful overshadowing or loss of light. Furthermore, as no windows are proposed in the side elevation, no overlooking of that neighbour would occur.
- 12.3 The support of the Parish Council for this proposal is noted. However, the identified harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the street scene and wider area, is considered significant enough to justify a refusal in this instance.
- 12.4 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 extension would have an awkward relationship with the existing building and by reason of it's forward projection, inappropriate design form and height, would create a visually intrusive feature within the street scene to the detriment of the character and local distinctiveness of the area. As such it would be contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, 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.

No pre application advice was sought prior to the application being submitted. Concerns were raised at the initial briefing stage, but the Parish Council supports the proposal. Although the Parish Council comments have been taken into consideration, the development is judged to be sufficiently harmful to justify a refusal in this instance.

Further Information:

Kate Cattermole

Telephone: 023 8028 5588

