Planning Development Control Committee - 17 May 2016

Report Item

2

Application No: 16/00178/FULL Full Application

Site: 19 Peterscroft Avenue, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7AB

Proposal: Two storey side extensions; raising of ridge height

Applicant: Mr R King Li

Case Officer: Emma MacWilliam

Parish: ASHURST AND COLBURY

1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Parish Council view

2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION

Defined New Forest Village

3. PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

DP1 General Development Principles DP11 Extensions to Dwellings CP8 Local Distinctiveness

4. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Design Guide SPD Ashurst and Colbury Village Design Statement

5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Sec 7 - Requiring good design

6. MEMBER COMMENTS

None received

7. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council: Recommend refusal. Although efforts have been made to revise the plans to overcome previous concerns, it was felt that the alterations did not go far enough. The proposed dwelling would still be inappropriate in terms of scale and bulk, would be out of keeping with the area and would still be contrary to the requirements of DP1, DP11, DP6 and CP8. The proposals are not in keeping with the Village Design Statement and there will be considerable visual impact on nearby

neighbours. It would also have a negative impact on the street scene as the proposals represent an undesirable increase in size, from the modest dwelling currently occupying the site, to a dwelling that is inappropriate in terms of size and scale.

8. CONSULTEES

8.1 Land Drainage (NFDC) – no further comments to make (no objection raised to previous application).

9. REPRESENTATIONS

- 9.1 Two letters of objection, revised scheme does not overcome previous concerns which include:
 - the running of a private business from home;
 - sub-division of the property to provide two homes;
 - associated drainage and sewage problems resulting from two kitchens and four bathrooms;
 - still an enormous property out of character with the wider area, contrary to the Design Guide and Ashurst VDS;
 - visual intrusion;
 - adverse impact on traffic;
 - loss of sunlight; and
 - overlooking.
- 9.2 One letter of support in praise of the design which will sit well within the 'eclectic' mix of various sized properties within the avenue.

10. RELEVANT HISTORY

10.1 Two-storey side extensions; Raising of ridge height (15/01012) refused on 16 February 2016. Appeal lodged and awaiting determination.

11. ASSESSMENT

- 11.1 The application site comprises a detached four bedroom bungalow located within the defined village of Ashurst. Peterscroft Avenue itself is a long residential cul-de-sac which is characterised by a wide range of dwelling types and sizes, all set within relatively spacious plots. There are several large trees within the immediate vicinity and a tree planting belt to the rear of the properties which help to create a soft backdrop to the residential development.
- This application follows an earlier refusal to extend the property to the side and to raise the eaves and ridge height to form a full two storey dwelling (see 10.1 above). The application was refused on the grounds of inappropriate size, form and scale, resulting in increased bulk and visual impact to the detriment of the character

of the wider area.

- 11.3 The relevant issue to consider therefore is whether this amended application (which has been informed through subsequent pre-application advice) is sufficient to overcome the previous reason for refusal.
- The amended scheme retains a two storey side extension and first floor additions to provide for a five bedroom dwelling, with all the bedrooms located on the first floor. However, the scale and bulk of the roof has been significantly reduced and this has been achieved by reducing the height of the main ridge by 1m to 7.5m (compared to 8.5m on the previous scheme) and reducing the eaves height by just under 1m on the east side elevation facing no. 21. Two first floor windows on the same east side elevation have been removed and replaced by two roof lights.
- 11.5 The eaves height and roof profile on the rear elevation have also been reconfigured to achieve a much improved design and reduced scale. Other minor changes have been made to some of the fenestration to accommodate the revised roof form.
- Whilst the concerns raised by the Parish Council and the neighbouring residents at nos. 17 and 21 are noted it is considered that the proposed development would not adversely affect the private residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers (and this was not a reason for refusing the previous application). A good degree of separation between these respective detached properties would be maintained. The two storey side extension would lie to the north east of no.17 and the lower eaves and ridge height proposed on this side elevation would not lead to any unacceptable loss of light (which is supported by the accompanying Daylighting and Sun Study).
- 11.7 With regards to the additional concerns raised by neighbouring properties and the Parish Council the application relates to the extension of an existing residential property and does not incorporate any proposals relating to a commercial enterprise or subdivision into two properties (in both cases a separate application would be required if this were proposed in future). Sewage and drainage issues would be a matter to be addressed at the Building Regulations stage and no objections were previously raised by Land Drainage in respect of surface water (the site is not within a flood zone). Although there are prominent trees within the site the proposed development would lie well away from the root protection areas.
- 11.8 To conclude, the net effect of all the changes incorporated in the revised scheme has been to reduce the scale, bulk and visual impact of the proposed additions such that it is considered that the proposed development is now of a much more appropriate scale and design and one that would be in keeping with its

residential surroundings. The existing dwelling is not a small dwelling and is therefore not subject to any floor space limits.

11.9 For all these reasons, the revised scheme overcomes the previous concerns in relation to size, form and scale and approval is therefore recommended.

12. RECOMMENDATION

Grant Subject to Conditions

Condition(s)

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.

No development shall take place until samples or exact details of the facing and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the New Forest National Park Authority.

Development shall only be carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable appearance of the building in accordance with Policy DP1 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (DPD) (December 2010).

