Planning Development Control Committee - 19 January 2016 Report Item 5

Application No: 15/00838/FULL Full Application

Site: Sandpipers, Normandy Lane, Lymington, SO41 8AE

Proposal: Addition of dormer windows to garage

Applicant: Mr Boyd

Case Officer: Liz Young

Parish: LYMINGTON AND PENNINGTON

1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Parish Council view

2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION

Flood Zone

3. PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

DP1 General Development Principles DP12 Outbuildings CP8 Local Distinctiveness

4. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Design Guide SPD

5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Sec 7 - Requiring good design

6. MEMBER COMMENTS

None received

7. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Lymington & Pennington Town Council: Recommend approval; External impact of the building would be enhanced.

8. CONSULTEES

No consultations required

9. REPRESENTATIONS

9.1 None received.

10. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 10.1 Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a proposed rear extension and extension to existing basement (15/00324) raise no objection on 10 June 2015
- 10.2 Addition of dormer windows to garage (15/00122) refused on 1 April 2015
- 10.3 Addition of dormer windows to garage (14/00761)approved on 27 November 2014
- 10.4 Insertion of dormer at first floor; ground floor extension; enlargement of existing dormer at first floor (14/00573) approved on 21 August 2014
- 10.5 Erect detached double garage with workshop / study over (93/52080) approved on 7 June 1993

11. ASSESSMENT

- 11.1 The application site lies in a fairly remote location overlooking the salt marshes on the edge of Lymington. It comprises a split level dwelling constructed on a brick plinth with white render above and a plain clay tile roof and a detached outbuilding built of similar materials. The site is not directly adjoined by any residential properties.
- 11.2 The outbuilding was originally approved in 1993 as a workshop with study over (consent 52080) and Condition 2 of this consent seeks to ensure the building would be used only for purposes incidental to the main house. More recently consent (reference 14/00761) was granted to add dormer windows to the north-east (rear) elevation of the garage. This application was approved on the basis that amended plans were submitted whilst the scheme consideration. amendments under These negotiations securing the deletion of dormers proposed on the south west (road facing) elevation. Following this approval consent (reference 15/00122) was then sought for a double dormer to the rear (north east) elevation and these plans also re-introduced the dormers originally proposed to the front (south west) elevation which were negotiated out at the time of the earlier application. The proposal was effectively identical to the scheme originally submitted under reference 15/00122 and was therefore turned down due to the cumulative impact of adding further to the number of dormer windows and the scale and domestic character of the resultant outbuilding.

- 11.3 This application again proposes the double dormer to the rear (north east) elevation which formed part of the plans approved under planning consent 14/00761. However two dormers are again proposed to the front. The size of the dormers has been slightly reduced from the dimensions of the more recently refused scheme (15/00122). The height of each dormer has been reduced from 2.1 metres down to 1.7 metres and width has been reduced from 1.5 metres down to 1.3 metres. The central rooflight which also formed part of the previously refused scene has been deleted.
- 11.4 Planning policy remains unchanged since the previous application. The basis upon which the recent consent was granted was that the proposed alterations would not impact significantly upon the road-facing elevation of the building and because the overall scale of the resulting building was considered appropriate when viewed alongside the main house. The main issue under consideration would therefore be whether the current proposals would conflict with these earlier objectives along with the extent to which any amendments to the design would address the concerns which led to the recent refusal.
- 11.5 It remains the case that no additional information has been provided to justify the scheme or explain why the design conflicts with previous case officer negotiations. As noted previously it is considered that the approved plans satisfactorily accommodate the use of the building as study and games room and the proposal to re-introduce the dormer windows would (notwithstanding a very modest reduction in size) add significantly to the overall volume and domestic character of the building to the extent that it would compete with the main frontage of the house and impact upon views from the highway.
- Although the central rooflight is no longer proposed this element of the proposals did not cause concern at the time of the previous application (the dormers being the most prominent and obtrusive aspect of the proposal). The proposals would therefore fail to be appropriate or incidental to the main house and would be in conflict with the requirements of Policies DP1 and DP6 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy.
- 11.7 Pages 35 and 36 of the Design Guide recognise outbuildings as an essential part of rural character and that two storey outbuildings can impact badly upon the appearance of sites at their boundaries. This document states that outbuildings should be incidental to the main house in scale and appearance and that smaller dwellings usually require modest outbuildings which should ideally diminish in scale to minimise bulk. The proposals would be at odds with this guidance through adding significantly to the overall perceived bulk and domestic appearance of the building. It is also important to note that Policy CP8 specifically

recognises the cumulative and longer term implications of individual small scale developments in terms of eroding the rural qualities of the New Forest National Park and the development is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy CP8 and also the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy.

- 11.8 The introduction of dormer windows to outbuildings is an issue which frequently causes concern, particularly in relation to their domestic appearance and the large number of unlawful conversions to self-contained units across the New Forest (reference National Park. An appeal decision APP/B9506/D/10/2128556) which highlights the harmful impact that dormer windows can have relates to an outbuilding proposal within the National Park near Ringwood. Whilst noting that the proposal would not impact upon public views, the Inspector resolved to dismiss the appeal for an outbuilding with three dormer windows on the basis that the dormers would change the character from a simple garage structure to something more imposing, thereby having an urbanising impact upon the character of the area. This current proposal relates to a significantly more modest plot and house with an additional impact upon public views, thereby demonstrating the harmful visual impact of the development.
- In conclusion, the slightly more modest dormers now proposed would fail overcome the recent refusal and also would not satisfy the objectives clearly set out at the time the previous scheme. This earlier scheme was approved on the basis that, from the public highway, the appearance of the outbuilding would remain almost identical to existing, and thus there would be no adverse impact on the character of the immediate surroundings. This latest proposal would have a significant and direct impact upon its surroundings and it its therefore recommended that the application should be refused.

12. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s)

The proposed roof alterations would, in terms of their cumulative impact, result in a building which by virtue of its scale and domestic character would fail to be appropriate or incidental to the main house. The proposal would result in a harmful and urbanising visual impact upon the character of the area and would therefore be contrary to Policies DP1, DP6 and CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Pages 35 to 36 of the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

