Planning Committee

11 July 2018

Item 3 c

Application Number: 18/10595 Full Planning Permission

Site:

OLIVE COTTAGE, PARK LANE, MARCHWOOD SO40 4WL

Development:

Two-storey rear extension; single-storey rear extension; front

porch; flue

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs Jepson

Target Date:

26/06/2018

Extension Date:

16/07/2018

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Subject to Conditions

Case Officer:

Jacky Dawe

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Parish Council view

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

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

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Proposal

Decision Date Decision

Status

Appeal Description

17/11545 Two-storey

12/01/2018

Refused

Description

Decided

rear extension; porch;

XX/NFR/10420/2 House 09/04/1968 and garage, existing

Granted Subject Decided to Conditions

dwelling on site to be

demolished.

5 **COUNCILLOR COMMENTS**

No comments received

6 **PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Marchwood Parish Council: recommend refusal due to visual impact and scale

7 **CONSULTEE COMMENTS**

No comments received

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED 8

One objection received on the following grounds:

- length, height and width
- disproportionate
- erode definition and proportions
- imposing development on prominent corner location
- harmful to character of the area
- impact on light and amenity

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 all the above apply. Pre- application advice was given following the refusal in January 2018 prior to this application being submitted. The current proposal follows the advice given by officers. As the application was acceptable as submitted, subject to submission of an amended plan to correct a discrepancy, no specific further actions were required.

12 ASSESSMENT

- 12.1 The application site falls within the built up area. A traditional forest cottage, its form contributes to the semi-rural character of the road. It is on a corner plot at the entrance to Park Close. The front is open and views are achievable from the front, side and rear.
- 12.2 The main issues for consideration are the impacts upon neighbour amenity, street scene and character of the area.
- 12.3 This application follows the refusal of 17/11545 for a two-storey rear extension, porch and flue in January 2018. This application was refused due to its overall length, height and width, being considered as a disproportionate and imposing addition. Subsequent clarification advice was sought and the current application conforms to the advice given.
- 12.4 The current proposal has reduced the length of the first floor extension by 1m to give a rearward extent of 4.5 m and changed the roof configuration provides a double gable facing the side boundaries of the site. The ground floor extension has however been increased by 1.5m compared to previous refusal. The front porch and flue remains as previous proposed but no issues were raised with these elements of the previous scheme. The materials have been amended to be matching brick and slate. The hedge to the side boundary with Park Close would be retained.
- These changes have reduced the overall bulk of the proposal when viewed from Park Close. By replicating the scale and form of the original dwelling this extension represents a traditional way of extending the property and is aesthetically pleasing in form and sympathetic to the existing dwelling. The proposals would be seen from public vantage points and particularly from the corner with Park Close, however due to the changes that have been made to the scheme it is now considered to be of a proportionate scale and as such it would not detract from the rural character of the area or be overly dominant within the street scene. The front porch is an appropriate addition to the property reflecting its traditional form.
- 12.6 The single-storey rear extension would be 2.5 m deep to give a rearward extent of 7.0 m. This increases the depth of the overall extension by 1.5 m when compared to the previous scheme. However the single storey element compliments the two-storey addition and would not be dominant in the street scene. Furthermore, it would not extend beyond the existing garage on the site which is located close to the boundary with Brymaril and furthermore would not extend beyond the existing rear extension of this neighbour.
- 12.7 In terms of neighbouring amenity, the overall proposal would be set 2.6 m back relative to the rear extensions of the neighbouring property Brymaril. The two storey element being set back by 5.1 m. This

neighbour has three existing side windows, all of which are obscurely glazed however one of these windows has been identified by this neighbour as serving an habitable room. The proposed extension would be located to the north west of this property, however neighbour amenity would not be harmfully affected by these proposals by way of dominance or loss of light, despite these side windows.

- 12.8 The same bat survey has been submitted as with the previous application, the report concluded that the opportunities are overall negligible and bat and bird species are unlikely to be significantly affected. The Ecologist was consulted and recommendations made that a condition should be added to include the provision of bat and bird boxes to provide enhancements which would assist accordance Local Plan Policies CS3 and DM2.
- 12.9 For the reasons that are set out in the above assessment given the changes that have now been made to the scheme these are considered to address the previous concerns and as such the application is recommended for approval.
- 12.10 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 there may be an interference with these rights and the rights of other third parties, such interference has to be balanced with the like rights of the applicant to develop the land in the way proposed. In this case it is considered that the protection of the rights and freedoms of the applicant outweigh any possible interference that may result to any third party.

13. RECOMMENDATION

Grant Subject to Conditions

Proposed Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:

To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and

Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: jeps sht 1, jeps sht 2 and jeps sht 3 A.

Reason:

To ensure satisfactory provision of the development.

3. The external facing materials shall match those used on the existing building.

Reason:

To ensure an acceptable appearance of the building in accordance with policy CS2 of the Local Plan for the New Forest District outside the National Park Core Strategy.

4. The works should be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations contained in the ecological report by ARBTECH submitted on 28 December 2017. A measure of biodiversity compensation/enhancement in the form of a suitable bat/bird box on a south facing aspect of the building or other suitable structure in the application site should be provided prior to occupation and thereafter retained unless otherwise agreed.

Reason:

In order to secure compliance with CS3 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park and DM2 New Forest District (outside the National Park) and Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management.

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 all the above apply. Pre- application advice was given following the refusal in January 2018 and prior to this application being submitted. The current proposal follows the advice given by officers. As the application was acceptable as submitted, subject to submission of an amended block plan, no specific further actions were required.

2This decision relates to amended / additional plans received by the Local .Planning Authority on 20 June 2018

Further Information:

Jacky Dawe

Telephone: 023 8028 5588

