Planning Committee - 19 October 2021

Report Item 2

Application No: 21/00767/FULL Full Application

Site: 40 New Road, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7BS

Proposal: Single storey extension; cladding; alterations to doors and windows;

2no. outbuildings

Applicant: Mr K Ward & Ms E Manning

Case Officer: Carly Cochrane

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

DP2 General development principles

DP18 Design principles

DP36 Extensions to dwellings

SP17 Local distinctiveness

4. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Ashurst and Colbury Village Design Statement

5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Sec 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Sec 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Sec 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

6. MEMBER COMMENTS

None received

7. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council: Recommend refusal. It was felt by all members that this application was contrary to:

- DP37 as the home office was not adjacent to the main dwelling,
- DP2 it is not appropriate and sympathetic to scale
- DP36 not appropriate to existing dwelling

8. CONSULTEES

No consultations required

9. REPRESENTATIONS

- 9.1 Three letter of representation have been received.
- 9.2 One letter of representation supports the application, and one makes comment in relation to whether the proposal is compliant with the floorspace restriction.
- 9.3 One letter of representation raises an objection to the application; the main issues raised are in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy as a result of the window within the gable end.

10. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 10.1 Single storey extension; demolition of outbuilding (19/00922) granted on 28 January 2020. Appeal against imposition of conditions dismissed 22 June 2020
- 10.2 Single storey and first floor extension (19/00526) withdrawn on 08 October 2019

11. ASSESSMENT

- 11.1 The application property is located to the north eastern side of New Road and comprises a detached bungalow which backs onto properties at Ash Grove and Ashdene Road. The site is located within the defined village boundary, and is a small dwelling for the purposes of applying Policy DP36.
- By way of background, planning permission was granted in 2020 11.2 for a single storey rear extension which in terms of floorspace. met the 100 square metre floorspace restriction for small dwellings. Permitted development rights were removed as part of the permission as there would be scope for the dwelling to be further extended beyond the 100sgm limitation should they remain intact. The imposition of this condition was challenged at appeal, and was dismissed, with the Inspector considering that there was a "clear policy basis to prevent the further extension of the dwelling...accordingly, [I find] there is clear justification for removing permitted development rights". Despite the extant permission, an extension was constructed under the belief that it constituted permitted development. Due to the fact that the extension adjoins an original side wall, as well as it being timber clad, the extension does not meet the limitations of permitted development. Further, it is understood that the two outbuildings were installed with the belief that they adhered to the limitations of

permitted development, however, a site inspection highlighted that, due to their proximity to the boundary and height, and also in relation to the 'store', its relationship with the main dwelling, being to the side, neither met the limitations of permitted development.

- 11.3 This application therefore seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear and side 'L' shaped extension which wraps around the original north eastern corner of the dwelling, as well as for two outbuildings within the rear garden. The extension would project a maximum of approximately 5.1 metres from the rear elevation, to include an eaves overhang upon the rearmost elevation, supported by braces. The eaves height would match that of the main dwellinghouse, and the ridge would also match the height of an existing diminishing element. The extension has been constructed using brick and dark stained, horizontally-hung timber cladding. The outbuilding adjacent to the rear and side boundaries would be used as a home office, and would be clad in vertically hung timber, with a flat roof. The outbuilding located in closer proximity to the dwellinghouse comprises a container which would be timber clad to appear similar to the home office outbuilding. As all elements exist, the application is therefore retrospective in nature.
- 11.4 As aforementioned, the property is a small dwelling, with a floorspace of 67.3sqm on the baseline date of 01 July 1982. As such, it is limited to a maximum of 100sqm. It is calculated that the extension (which would result in a total floorspace of 99.8sqm) meets, but does not exceed this limitation, and is therefore policy compliant in this respect. As the extension obscures the entire original rear, there is no scope for any further extension under permitted development, and therefore there is no requirement to remove permitted development rights via the imposition of a condition.
- 11.5 The Parish have recommended refusal of the application and in relation to the extension, have commented that it is not considered to be appropriate to the existing dwelling as it is not appropriate or sympathetic in scale. Irrespective of whether a proposal is compliant in respect of floorspace, the additional floorspace that can be added is not an entitlement, and there are circumstances where an extension which utilises the entire additional floorspace (in this case, up to 100sgm) may not be appropriate. In terms of its design, the extension would not exceed either the eaves or ridgeline of the main dwellinghouse, and would not project towards either side boundary. The presence of a fully glazed gable end is not normally encouraged in more sensitive locations due to light pollution and the impact upon the dark night skies of the National Park, however, due to the single storey nature of the extension, the inclusion of an eaves overhang to limit upward light transmission and the location of the property within a defined village, in this instance, it is considered acceptable. The use of brick or a painted render would be

appropriate, and whilst the use of the dark stained timber cladding is not a common treatment upon dwellings within the area and creates a stark contrast with the main dwellinghouse, compounded by the use of black fascia boards, it is not considered to result in an unacceptable appearance. Overall, the extension, whilst utilising the entirety of the 100sqm, is not considered to appear overly dominant or be of an inappropriate design.

- An objection has been received by the occupier of a neighbouring property in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy as a result of the glazed gable end. As aforementioned, the ridge height of the extension is lower than that of the main dwellinghouse, which is a single storey bungalow. Internally, the ceiling is vaulted, with no floorspace within the roof. The window is therefore set well above eye level, and, whilst it may be visible from within the neighbouring property, it does not provide any opportunity for overlooking. Similarly, it is not considered that the extension appears unduly overbearing, nor does it result in any significant loss of light; therefore, it is not considered that the extension results in any significant adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity.
- 11.7 In relation to the proposed detached outbuildings, Policy DP37 of the Local Plan sets out that domestic outbuildings will be permitted where they are proportionate and clearly subservient to the dwelling they are to serve in terms of scale and design; located within the residential curtilage; would be used for purposes incidental to the main dwelling and not include any habitable accommodation; and would not reduce the private amenity space or parking provision around the dwelling to an unacceptable level. In this instance, the outbuildings would be clearly subservient in their scale and design in comparison to the main dwellinghouse. Whilst the store building would be partially visible within the street scene, it would not appear overly prominent or dominant. The use of the outbuildings would be for incidental purposes, and there would be no impact upon parking provision or private amenity space. The Parish have raised concerns that the home office is not adjacent to the main dwelling. This is not a criteria of the policy; it is well located within the curtilage, and due to the modest sized plot, is well related to the main dwellinghouse. Overall, it is considered that the proposal accords with the criteria of Policy DP37.
- 11.8 It is therefore recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions, as the proposal is in accordance with Policies DP2, DP18, DP36, DP37 and SP17 of the adopted Local Plan 2016-2036.

12. RECOMMENDATION

Grant Subject to Conditions

Condition(s)

Development shall only be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 869.PA01 A, DR1, DR2.

No alterations to the approved development shall be made unless otherwise agreed in writing by the New Forest National Park Authority.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable appearance of the building in accordance with Policies SP16, SP17, DP18 and DP2 of the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016- 2036 (August 2019).

The outbuildings the subject of this permission shall only be used for purposes incidental to the dwelling on the site and shall not be used for habitable accommodation such as kitchens, living rooms and bedrooms.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the countryside in accordance with Policies DP36 and DP37 of the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016- 2036 (August 2019).

Informative(s):

The Authority has considered the application in relation to its adopted Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and any other relevant material planning consideration and has confirmed to the applicant or their agent that the development is compliant and does not harm the character and appearance or amenities of the area.

