Planning Development Control Committee - 19 March 2019 Report Item

3

Application No: 19/00060/FULL Full Application

Site: 6 Pages Lane, East Boldre, Brockenhurst, SO42 7WG

Proposal: Two storey side extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Patience

Case Officer: Carly Cochrane

Parish: EAST BOLDRE

1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Parish Council view

2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION

Conservation Area

3. PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

DP1 General Development Principles DP6 Design Principles DP11 Extensions to Dwellings CP8 Local Distinctiveness

CP7 The Built Environment

4. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Design Guide SPD

5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Sec 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Sec 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

6. MEMBER COMMENTS

None received

7. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

East Boldre Parish Council: Recommend permission. The proposal falls within the 100m2 floor space limitation. It does not impact in any negative way on the surrounding area.

8. CONSULTEES

No consultations required

9. REPRESENTATIONS

- 9.1 Eight letters of representation have been received, in support of the application. The comments made are summarised as follows;
 - Proposal is a modest addition and unobtrusive
 - Proposal is in-keeping with the area
 - There would be no impact on neighbour's views

10. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 10.1 Two storey side extension (18/000691) withdrawn on 26 September 2018
- 10.2 Ground and first floor addition (NFDC/98/64152) granted on 31 July 1998

11. ASSESSMENT

- 11.1 The application site is located to the northern side of Pages Lane, and comprises the right hand facing, two storey dwellinghouse in a semi-detached pair. The dwelling is constructed using brick, with a tiled roof and white uPVC windows and doors. The property has been previously significantly extended to the rear. The site lies within the Forest South East Conservation Area, and the property, along with its adjoining neighbour and two more semi-detached pairs of an identical design and appearance, have been identified within the Conservation Area Character Appraisal as being of local interest; as such, the property is a small dwelling, with a pre-1982 floorspace of approximately 67 square metres.
- 11.2 By way of background, planning permission was granted in 1998 for a two and single storey extension; this resulted in a total floorspace of approximately 85 square metres. Pre-application advice was sought in 2016 with regard to the amount of floorspace remaining before the floorspace limitation under Policy DP11 would be reached. In 2018, an application for a two storey side extension was submitted, and subsequently withdrawn, as it was advised that, not only did the proposal exceed the floorspace limitation (being 100 square metres for a small dwelling), but there were also concerns that a two storey side extension was inappropriate in any event due to the modest size of the original dwelling and contrived appearance of the proposal. Following the withdrawn application, pre-application advice was sought on three designs for a two storey side extension; none of these schemes were considered acceptable or appropriate by Officers, and the concerns previously raised were not considered to have been overcome.

- 11.3 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension, of a design not dissimilar to those put forward and advised against at pre-application stage. The proposed extension would have a width of approximately 1.3 metres at its widest point, stepping in at the rear to approximately 1 metre; 5.8 metres in depth, 4.2 metres in height to the eaves to match that of the main dwellinghouse, and 5.6 metres in height to the ridge. However, the proposed extension would attach to the two storey element constructed pursuant to NFDC/98/64152, and in order to create and incorporate the width of the proposed extension under the same section of roof, the ridgeline of the existing two storev element has been increased by approximately 400mm. Internally, the proposal allows for an additional first floor bedroom, and an extended kitchen, new utility and shower room at ground floor. The proposed extension would be constructed using matching materials.
- 11.4 As aforementioned, the property is a small dwelling, and therefore in accordance with Policy DP11 of the Core Strategy, an extension is limited in floorspace to a maximum of 100 square metres. It is calculated that the proposal complies with this limitation, and is therefore policy compliant in this respect.
- 11.5 However, Policy DP11 also states that "Extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted provided that they are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage". The supporting text in paragraph 7.38 sets out that "the floorspace limitations...are a maximum limit and although the extension may comply with the criterion on size, there could be another harmful impact which would make the proposal unacceptable." As such, the additional floorspace, in this case to a maximum of 100 square metres, would only be considered acceptable when assessed against all other planning considerations. The supporting text also states that "In all cases, the Authority will have regard to the scale and character of the core element of the original dwelling (rather than subsequent additions) in determining whether or not an extension is sympathetic to the dwelling".
- 11.6 By virtue of the previous extension, the property has an approximate 15 square metres remaining before the maximum 100 square metres is reached. As such, and given the applicants desire to create an additional first floor bedroom, this dictates the design, as ground floor space needs to be added to then create a first floor above. This equates to a floor area of approximately six square metres to be created at both ground and first floor. The resultant design, then, is considered to be one which is contrived. When viewed from the front, the extension is narrow, with the windows abutting the side elevation of the main dwellinghouse which results in a cramped appearance. Whilst, as a result of the narrow width, the extension when viewed from the front would be subservient in scale, it is because of its narrow width that it is also

considered as a forced and unsympathetic addition. When viewed from the side (east), the step in the side elevation of the proposed extension, required in order to not exceed the floorspace limitation, results in a piecemeal appearance. When viewed from the rear, and with the increase in the width and height of the existing two storey element required in order to accommodate the proposal, the total extended part is of a scale which competes with the original dwellinghouse and would no longer appear subservient, sympathetic or proportionate. Despite the compliance with the floorspace restriction, it is considered that the proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the site, to a degree which detracts from the original dwellinghouse, and therefore the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset and therefore the conservation area.

- 11.7 The proposal would not result in any adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity, however this does not outweigh the contrived design and resultant inappropriate appearance.
- 11.8 It is therefore recommended that permission be refused.

12. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s)

The proposed development, by virtue of its contrived design, scale, massing and cumulative impact with the existing extension, would not be sympathetic or appropriate to the original dwellinghouse, and would constitute an incongruous overdevelopment. The development would dominate, and therefore be harmful to, the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset and therefore the conservation area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DP1, DP6, DP11, CP7 and CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (December 2010) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

