

**Application No: 17/00138/FULL Full Application**

**Site:** Gardenia, Winsor Road, Winsor, Southampton, SO40 2HR

**Proposal:** Replacement dwelling

**Applicant:** Ms H Shergold

**Case Officer:** Clare Ings

**Parish:** COPYTHORNE

---

**1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

Contrary to Parish Council view

**2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION**

No specific designation

**3. PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

CP7 The Built Environment  
CP8 Local Distinctiveness  
DP1 General Development Principles  
DP6 Design Principles  
DP10 Replacement Dwellings  
DP11 Extensions to Dwellings

**4. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE**

Design Guide SPD

**5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

Sec 7 - Requiring good design  
Sec 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

**6. MEMBER COMMENTS**

None received

**7. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Copythorne Parish Council: Recommend permission.

## **8. CONSULTTEES**

No consultations required

## **9. REPRESENTATIONS**

9.1 None received.

## **10. RELEVANT HISTORY**

10.1 Demolition of dwelling (application for Prior Notification of proposed demolition) (16/00639) - no further details required on 15 August 2016

10.2 Replacement dwelling; detached garage (16/00299) refused on 15 June 2016. Appealed, with appeal decision pending.

## **11. ASSESSMENT**

11.1 Gardenia is a typical two storey red brick detached forest cottage situated along Winsor Road. It has an unsympathetic two-storey flat roofed extension to the rear. Within the plot is a small single garage and currently a large mobile home. It lies in a fairly generous plot, within frontage development of mixed styles, sizes and ages, including a number of replacement dwellings, and bungalows, including Cedar to the south. Other residential development and the local junior school lie opposite, whilst to the rear are playing fields. The dwelling lies on the brow of the hill and just outside the Forest North East Conservation Area.

11.2 As can be seen from the history, a recent application for a replacement dwelling and garage was refused and is currently at appeal (decision pending), one of the reasons being that it exceeded the 30% floorspace restrictions of policies DP10 and DP11. This application is also for a replacement dwelling; the design has been modified to ensure that it would comply with the floorspace restrictions. The replacement dwelling would have a longer frontage than the existing dwelling (14m as oppose to 9.5m), albeit with a single storey element to the north, with two projecting gables to the rear, with the largest having a greater depth than the existing dwelling (just over 9m as oppose to just over 7m). The ridge height would be comparable with the existing at about 7m. The covered veranda and balcony of the previous application have been removed. Materials would be red brick and clay tiles roof. The replacement garage of the previous application has also be removed.

11.3 The main issues under consideration would be as follows:

- The extent of floorspace increase of the replacement dwelling based upon the property as it existed on 1 July 1982
- The impact the proposed development would have upon the

visual amenity of the street scene character and appearance of the area, the adjoining conservation area and wider open forest landscape

- Impact upon amenity of neighbouring residents
- Any implications for ecological

11.4 The site lies outside the four defined villages of the New Forest National Park, and therefore would be subject to restrictions in the increase in habitable floorspace contained within policies DP10 and DP11. Specifically policy DP10 restricts the size of the replacement dwelling to *"no greater floorspace than the existing dwelling"*. At the same time, however, an extension can be considered under policy DP11, and this policy restricts this increase to no more than 30% of the original floorspace (or if a small dwelling, to no more than a total of 100m<sup>2</sup>). The dwelling had a floorspace of approximately 121m<sup>2</sup> and therefore would not be classed as a small dwelling. This current proposal would result in a total habitable floorspace of 156m<sup>2</sup> taking into account the floorspace at first floor level with a head height of 1.5m, equivalent to 29% and within the 30% set out in policies DP10 and DP11.

11.5 Notwithstanding the fact that the replacement dwelling would meet the floorspace restrictions of policies DP10 and DP11, it is not considered that the replacement would sympathetically reflect the existing dwelling's modest and unassuming proportion. The existing house, because of its traditional appearance, contributes in a positive way and certainly not a negative manner to the character of the surrounding area and thus its demolition would not be in line with other aspects of policy DP10 which states: *'replacement dwellings will not be permitted where the existing dwelling makes a positive contribution to the historic character and appearance of the locality'*. The existing dwelling has modest and unassuming proportions (a 9.5m frontage to Winsor Road and a height to ridge of 7m) and traditional narrow-span proportions which are characteristic of the 19th century New Forest cottage. However, the replacement dwelling with its increased frontage (by some 4.5m) and greater depth of the rear projecting gables (by about 2m for the larger) would not sympathetically reflect these qualities and depth of plan form and because of the position of the dwelling at the brow of the hill, this combination of increased length, height and no subservient element, would result in a dwelling with a much more dominating impact on the street scene to the detriment of the character of the wider area. Specifically this dominating impact is as a result of the additional floorspace not appearing subservient to the replacement "core element". The elongated front elevation and the increase in depth of the larger of the projecting gables both help to emphasise this greater bulk, contributing to the impact of the replacement dwelling when viewed in the street scene. Whilst a small single storey element has been added to the front elevation, overall this does little to reduce the overall bulk of the

dwelling. The additional floorspace would therefore not "read" as an extension with subservient elements, and thus the overall proposal would appear as an over-enlarged dwelling and would not comply with policy.

- 11.6 Since the application was refused, an application for the demolition of a building was submitted under Part 11 Class B of the 2016 Order. This is "permitted development", but the procedure is designed to deal with cases where the building is being demolished as a standalone operation. At the time, planning permission had been refused for the replacement dwelling (and demolition) and no appeal had been submitted; thus that application was considered on the basis of a separate operation and the Authority had to determine if details of the method of demolition were required. With this application, this is clearly not the case; the existing building needs to be demolished to make way for the replacement, and therefore the correct procedure is to submit a planning application to cover both the demolition and the new development. Had the dwelling been demolished under Part 11, the residential use of the site would have been considered to have been abandoned, and no replacement dwelling would therefore be permitted.
- 11.7 From the information available it is considered that the house is an undesignated heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 135 states the following with respect to undesignated heritage assets: *'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'*
- 11.8 The wholesale loss of an undesignated heritage asset would inevitably cause harm to the significance of the asset. It is considered that the existing house contributes in a positive way and certainly not a negative manner to the character of the area and its demolition would therefore not be in-line with advice laid out within the New Forest National Park's Core Strategy policy DP10 which states: *'replacement dwellings will not be permitted where the exiting dwelling makes a positive contribution to the historic character and appearance of the locality'*. No accompanying financial justification or building condition survey has been submitted to demonstrate why it would not be financially viable for the building to be repaired and retained.
- 11.9 A Bat Survey was submitted with the previous application, and is still relevant, which indicated the presence of a bat roost at the property, but that further evening survey work had not been possible to establish the full extent of use or characterise the roost; thus it has not been possible to establish whether the

current proposals for mitigation would be appropriate to deliver appropriate compensation and enhancement in line with policy CP2. In addition, there is a likelihood of nesting birds being affected. However as these issues could be covered by condition, it is not proposed to include a reason for refusal.

- 11.10 In conclusion, it is considered that the replacement dwelling would not comply with policies DP10 and DP11 as it would result in a dwelling which would be unsympathetic in scale to its surroundings. It would also result in the unnecessary loss of a traditional New Forest Cottage and undesignated heritage asset.

## **12. RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse

### **Reason(s)**

- 1 The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, bulk and design, would not reflect the existing dwelling's modest and unassuming proportions and qualities sympathetically and would present an increased street frontage to Winsor Road which would have a more dominating impact. In addition, insufficient information has been submitted to the National Park Authority demonstrating the need for the proposed demolition and replacement of the undesignated heritage asset. The replacement dwelling would therefore be contrary to Policies DP1, DP10, DP6 and CP7 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (December 2010).

