

ASH/19908/3 – Mr A Lord

Erection of a single dwelling, single garage and re-use existing access (resubmission)

Land adjoining Tilling, Berrycroft, Ashbury, SN6 8LX

1.0 The Proposal

- 1.1 The application is for a single dwelling with a detached single garage. The dwelling would measure a maximum width of 17.2 metres (13.5 of which is at two-storey height) and a maximum height of 7.6 metres. The proposal is adjacent to listed cottages to the north, and is within the Ashbury Conservation Area.
- 1.2 Extracts from the application plans are at **Appendix 1**.
- 1.3 This application is an amendment to a previous permission on the site for a single dwelling which was renewed in 2007, and remains extant. This application is submitted further to a previously refused scheme, which was also an amendment to the permitted scheme. This application seeks to address the refusal reason. The planning history is set out below, and the permitted and refused schemes are appended.
- 1.3 The application comes to Committee at the request of the Local Member Councillor Yvonne Constance.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 ASH/9768/4 – Erection of dwelling and new access. Permitted in November 2002.
- 2.2 ASH/199908 – Erection of new dwelling, double garage and re-use existing access. Withdrawn in February 2007.
- 2.3 ASH/19908/1 – Erection of new dwelling, double garage and re-use existing access. Withdrawn in July 2007.
- 2.4 ASH/19908/2 – Erection of new dwelling, double garage and re-use existing access. Refused in November 2007 due to the dominant and harmful impact the proposal would have on the adjacent Listed Building, and the subsequent harm it would have on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The refused scheme is at Appendix 2.
- 2.5 ASH/9768/7 – Renewal of planning permission ASH/9768/4 for the erection of a dwelling and new access. Permitted in November 2007. The permitted scheme is at Appendix 3.

3.0 Planning Policies

- 3.1 Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan requires development to be of a high design quality in terms of layout, scale, mass, height, detailing, materials to be used, and its relationship with adjoining buildings, and to take into account local distinctiveness. Policy DC5 of the adopted Local Plan requires safe and convenient access and parking.

- 3.2 Policy DC9 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to ensure development will not unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment.
- 3.3 Policy HE1 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to ensure proposals would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Policy HE4 of the adopted Local Plan resists proposals that would not respect the setting of a Listed Building.
- 3.4 Policy H11 of the adopted Local Plan allows for new housing sites of up to about 0.5 ha and not more than 15 dwellings within the built up areas of the larger villages.

4.0 **Consultations**

- 4.1 Ashbury Parish Council does not object but requests the following issues be taken into consideration:
- Requests that the ground level be lowered by at least half a metre
 - Requests the use appropriate building materials
 - Must consider appropriate construction of the access
 - The full comments of the Parish council are at Appendix 4.
- 4.2 County Engineer – “The proposal as submitted revises an existing extant permission, therefore there are no objections subject to conditions.”
- 4.3 8 letters of objection have been received from 4 different households. Their comments can be summarised as follows:
- There have been only small and cosmetic changes when compared to the permitted scheme (at Appendix 3)
 - Concerns are raised with regard to the size and scale of the dwelling
 - The proposal will dominate the surrounding cottages
 - Concerns are raised with regard to the increased risk of flooding
 - Concerns are raised with regard to the impact of the proposal on the amenities of neighbouring properties
 - The proposal would be visible within the surrounding landscape
 - Concerns are raised with regard to highway safety issues, in particular the access, the increase in vehicular movements, the poor state of the lane and its narrow width
 - The proposal would fill the existing gap between the listed buildings and the 20th century housing
 - The proposal would be out of keeping within the Conservation Area
 - The revised application is twice the size of the permitted scheme (at Appendix 3)
 - The style and materials of the dwelling are not in character with the area

5.0 **Officer Comments**

- 5.1 The application has been submitted following a previous refusal on the site for a single dwelling and detached garage which was refused due to the harmful impact of the proposal on the adjacent Listed Buildings, and the impact on the Conservation Area.

The refused scheme is at Appendix 2. It should be noted that there is an extant planning permission on the site for a single dwelling, which was renewed in 2007; therefore the principle of residential development on this site has already been established. Whilst the proposal would fall slightly outside the general line of buildings along Berrycroft, it is still considered to be within the general built form of the village, especially as there is residential development to the north. Whilst it is noted some public views would be lost towards the fields to the rear of the site, this is not considered to be so significant to justify refusal, especially as a dwelling has already been permitted on the site.

- 5.2 The proposed dwelling is larger compared to that already permitted on the site, and is not dissimilar in size to the previously refused. However the proposal has now been 'broken-up' compared to the previous refused scheme, and part of the ridge-line has now been set down. Furthermore the single storey element has now been moved to the north side of the dwelling. The proposal now has the appearance of a smaller dwelling when compared to the refused scheme, with a central structure, with smaller additions to the north and south. The change of position of the single storey element now creates a greater visual separation between the proposal and the Listed Buildings to the north. Whilst it is appreciated the land is higher on the application site, due to the location of this single storey element, the distance between the proposal and the Listed Buildings (which is more than 10 metres) and the other changes to the design described above, it is not considered that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings, or be harmful to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this regard it is noted that the Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposal. Given the differences in the land levels between the application site and the adjacent Listed Buildings it is considered reasonable that a slab level condition is imposed in the event of planning permission being granted, to control the level at which the proposed dwelling is built.
- 5.3 The proposed dwelling would face towards the rear garden of No.3 Berrycroft, however given the distance of approximately 12 metres to the common boundary it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the neighbour's amenities. It is noted that the garage has been reduced in size compared to the previously refused application. No objections were raised to the previous garage, and given that it has now been reduced in size it is not considered to have any harmful impact on the character of the area or neighbour's amenities.
- 5.4 Whilst the comments received from the neighbouring residents regarding the access and other highway issues are noted, the County Engineer has raised no objections to the proposal noting that permission has already been granted for a single dwelling. Notwithstanding this the County Engineer requests details of the visibility splays, parking and boundary treatments to be approved by condition.
- 5.5 Comments from the Principal Drainage Engineer were not received at the time of writing this report, however his comments on the previous application are noted which stated that the applicant will need to demonstrate that surface water could be satisfactorily disposed of. It needs to be noted, of course, that planning permission exists for a dwelling on the site. Given the differences in land levels it is considered to be reasonable to impose a condition requesting details of the proposed drainage system (both surface water and foul sewage).

6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 *It is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the following conditions.*

1. *TL1 Time limit*
2. *MC1 Submission of materials*
3. *RE7 Submission of boundary details*
4. *LS4 Landscaping scheme to be submitted*
5. *RE22 Floor/slab level details to be submitted*
6. *HY2 Submission of access details*
7. *HY24 Parking/turning area as shown on plan retained*