

Application No: 19/00290/FULL Full Application

Site: 8 Peterscroft Avenue, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7AB

Proposal: Pitched roof; new glazed gable and cladding to existing outbuilding

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Longman

Case Officer: Liz Young

Parish: ASHURST AND COLBURY

1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Referred by Ward Councillor.

2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION

Defined New Forest Village

3. PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

DP1 General Development Principles
CP8 Local Distinctiveness
DP12 Outbuildings

4. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Design Guide SPD
Ashurst and Colbury Village Design Statement

5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Sec 12 - Achieving well-designed places

6. MEMBER COMMENTS

None received

7. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council: Recommend refusal:

- The plans do not differ significantly from the previous application.
- Overbearing impact upon neighbouring properties.
- Building would not appear incidental to the main dwelling (DP12).
- The cladding would not be in keeping with the existing dwelling or the area.

- Concerns over massing and overdevelopment having regard to existing outbuildings.

8. **CONSULTEES**

No consultations required

9. **REPRESENTATIONS**

9.1 One letter of objection received from a neighbouring property:

- The proposal appears to be the same as the previous application.
- The proposed roof would be significant in terms of height.
- The building would still appear too high and will dominate the neighbouring properties to the south east.
- The existing building can hardly be seen.

10. **RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 10.1 Pitched roof, new glazed gable and cladding to outbuilding (18/00626) refused on 26 September 2018
- 10.2 Extension to outbuilding (retrospective application) (11/96060) appeal against refusal allowed with conditions on 27 July 2011
- 10.3 Rear two storey and first floor extensions; attached garage (08/93721) approved on 23 February 2009
- 10.4 Two-storey extensions; roof alterations to accommodate new first floor (08/93056) refused on 30 July 2008

11. **ASSESSMENT**

11.1 This application relates to a detached outbuilding which lies to the rear of Number 8 Peterscroft Avenue, a detached two storey house located within an area of spacious, residential development towards the edge of Ashurst and close to the open forest. The building was originally built as a garage, although the main garaging to the house now lies within an integral garage to the side of the property. The application building comprises facing brick work with a corrugated roof and a very low roofline.

Proposal

11.2 Consent is sought to re-roof the existing building and increase the overall roof height from 2.5 metres to 4.5 metres. Full height glazed windows would be added to the front (north) elevation in place of the existing garage doors, along with feature windows filling the apex of the gable above. A window and door are proposed to the east elevation. The external walls would be clad in timber and clay tiles are proposed on the roof.

Background

- 11.3 In terms of background this application has been submitted following the scheme which was previously refused for the following reason:

"The combined massing of the proposed roof alterations, conspicuous glazed frontage, together with the adjacent previously enlarged outbuilding, would appear as a prominent, incongruous development upsetting the openness of the site particularly when viewed from neighbouring properties. Visually, both of these outbuildings would combine to compete with the host property (already subject to a significant degree of enlargement) and other buildings in the immediate locality amounting to a harmful overdevelopment of the site. The proposed new roofline and prominent glazing would result in a building which would not appear as an incidental outbuilding, but as a significant building in its own right, resulting in a significant degree of visual intrusion when viewed from neighbouring properties. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy along with the New Forest Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 which seeks to ensure that outbuildings are subservient to the dwelling in scale and appearance."

- 11.4 The design, form and scale remain unchanged from the earlier scheme but additional information (along with two appeal decisions against Oxford City Council and the Borough of Kingston upon Thames) has now been included with the application, which is summarised as follows:

- The proposal would accommodate and showcase the applicant's vintage car collection and should therefore be assessed on this basis.
- The proposal is not proposed to be used for any habitable accommodation.
- The building could be conditioned to ensure it would only be used for purposes incidental to the dwelling (the NPPF advocates this approach).
- The existing outbuilding is ugly, not of high quality and is not appropriate to the character of the main dwelling with facing materials which contrast with the main house.
- The proposal would replicate the character of other dwellings in the locality and would re-enforce local distinctiveness.
- The proposal would not impact significantly upon public views.
- There would be no harmful loss of amenity to the occupants of Number 6.
- A building of up to four metres in height could be erected under permitted development.

The main issues under consideration would therefore relate to whether the additional information submitted overcomes the

Authority's previous concerns along with the implications of the emerging policies of the Local Plan (which has reached a more advanced stage than at the time of the predecessor application).

Policy Context

- 11.5 As noted at the time of the previous application, Policy DP12 recognises the considerable development pressure for larger outbuildings and the adverse impact they can have upon the rural qualities of the New Forest National Park. The policy also seeks to avoid habitable accommodation within such buildings. Pages 35 to 36 of the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document recognise outbuildings as an essential part of rural character but note the harmful impact that two storey outbuildings can have upon site boundaries. The guidance seeks to ensure such buildings are distanced from boundaries and diminish in scale to respond to different uses whilst minimising bulk. Policy CP8 specifically recognises the cumulative harm that individual, small-scale developments can have over time in terms of eroding the special rural qualities of the New Forest National Park.
- 11.6 In terms of site context, it remains the case that the application building lies directly alongside an existing outbuilding which itself was enlarged in 2011 through the addition of a 1.5 storey addition with dormer window. A conservatory has also been added to the building at some point following the 2011 consent, although this has not been shown on the plans accompanying the current application. The main house itself has also been subject to a significant degree of enlargement, following its original establishment a modest, low roofed bungalow of a compact footprint. Having regard to the extent of development which has already taken place across the site, it is considered that the combined massing of the two outbuildings, together with the conspicuous glazed frontage proposed, would appear as a prominent, incongruous development upsetting the openness of the site particularly when viewed from neighbouring properties. Visually, both of these outbuildings would combine to compete with the host property (already subject to a significant degree of enlargement) and other buildings in the immediate locality. The proposed new roofline and prominent glazing would result in a building which would not appear as an incidental outbuilding, but as a significant building in its own right. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy along with the New Forest Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 which seeks to ensure that outbuildings are subservient to the dwelling in scale and appearance.
- 11.7 With regards to emerging policies, the Authority continues to carefully control proposals for outbuildings through its Local Plan, while at the same time recognising the role of outbuildings in supporting home-working, for example. It is important that the

number, scale and design of any buildings within the curtilage of a dwelling should not detract from the character or appearance of the dwelling, the site and the surrounding area. Policy DP12 will be replaced by Policy DP37 of the emerging Local Plan. This emerging policy sets out the additional criteria that outbuildings should be proportionate and clearly subservient to the dwelling in terms of their design, scale, size, height and massing. On the basis that the emerging Plan is now well advanced in terms of preparation, that there were very limited representations to the draft policy DP37 and no modifications are proposed to the policy following the conclusion of the Examination hearing sessions, the Authority considers that Policy DP37 in the draft Local Plan 2016 – 2036 can be afforded weight in the planning decision-making process, in accordance with paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Material Considerations

- 11.8 Whilst the additional information now put forward is noted the agent had previously indicated an intention to accommodate cars within the building. This was not previously considered by the Authority to serve as sufficient justification for a building of the size and scale proposed. It remains the case that there is no information accompanying the application setting out the need for the additional roof space and glazing. The existing building is un-fenestrated and is not one which would lend itself to any form of habitable use. In contrast the proposed building would have a significantly more domestic character and increased scale. In terms of the need to "showcase" cars this would not serve to justify the prominent glazing in the apex of the gable.
- 11.9 Notwithstanding the suggestion that the building would be used to store cars, the existing building provides sufficient space for this use (along with the existing integral garage which was added to the property in 2009). The proposed alterations would result in a building which could (in addition to the existing outbuilding to the east) be readily adapted to habitable use without the need for any further external alterations in the longer term. Whilst it is the case that conditions could be imposed, a more appropriate approach would be to "design out" any habitable use. Furthermore, such conditions would not mitigate the fact that the character and scale of the building would fail to be appropriate or subservient to the main house (and would not make an otherwise unacceptable development acceptable).
- 11.10 The suggestion that the proposal has been designed to replicate the character of dwellings in the locality adds further to the Authority's concerns over lack of subservience, overly domestic form and conflict with the guidance set out within the Design Guide referenced above. With regards to permitted development and "fall back," the height of the building would need to be reduced to 2.5 metres or it would need to be positioned further

from the boundary (and the ridge height still lowered to four metres). Therefore, a building of the size and scale now proposed could not reasonably be carried out under permitted development. The two submitted appeal decisions would not give the Authority sufficient reason to permit this proposal as neither of these decisions relate to a National Park and both are located with the built-up areas of Oxford and Kingston-upon-Thames. Furthermore, the Kingston decision relates to a lawfulness application and in the case of the Oxford decision (which was in an area of terraced housing, three storey buildings and blocks of flats) this Authority did not benefit from any specific policies on outbuildings to support their refusal. Additionally, it was noted that the Oxford outbuilding was comparable in size with other outbuildings in the immediate locality.

Conclusion

- 11.11 As noted at the time of the previous application, the significant increase in overall ridge height of the building along with the prominent gabled roofline would be very apparent when viewed from neighbouring properties, particularly in the case of Number 6 to the west. This adjoining property enjoys a significantly more modest outdoor space to the rear and the proposal would therefore have a harmful and overbearing impact which would be detrimental to the occupants' enjoyment of this property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DP1. The additional information now submitted does not sufficiently address the Authority's previous concerns over lack of subservience and an overly domestic form and the suggestion that the proposal would reflect the design and character of dwellings rather than other outbuildings in the locality re-enforces these concerns. The emerging policies of the Local Plan seeks to add a greater degree of control over the size and form of outbuildings. It remains the case that the proposal would cumulatively add to the harmful, urbanising impact of development within the site having regard to the extent of previous additions and outbuildings and would therefore fail to meet the requirements of Policies DP1, CP8 and DP12 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy along with the requirements of the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. The proposal would also conflict with emerging policy objectives of ensuring outbuildings would (in terms of number, scale and design) not detract from the character or appearance of the dwelling, the site and the surrounding area. It is recommended that the application should be refused.

12. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s)

- 1 The combined massing of the proposed roof alterations, conspicuous glazed frontage, together with the adjacent previously enlarged outbuilding, would appear as a prominent, incongruous development upsetting the openness of the site particularly when viewed from neighbouring properties. Visually, both of these outbuildings would combine to compete with the host property (already subject to a significant degree of enlargement) and other buildings in the immediate locality amounting to a harmful overdevelopment of the site. The proposed new roofline and prominent glazing would result in a building which would not appear as an incidental outbuilding, but as a significant building in its own right, resulting in a significant degree of visual intrusion when viewed from neighbouring properties. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DP1, DP12 and CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (December 2010) along with the New Forest Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 which seeks to ensure that outbuildings are subservient to the dwelling in scale and appearance.



New Forest National Park Authority
Lymington Town Hall, Avenue Road,
Lymington, SO41 9ZG

Tel: 01590 646600 Fax: 01590 646666

Date: 03/07/2019

Ref: 19/00290/FULL

Scale: 1:2500

© Crown copyright and database rights 2019 Ordnance Survey 100014703