

Schedule Of Planning Applications For Consideration

In The following Order:

Part 1) Applications Recommended For Refusal

Part 2) Applications Recommended for Approval

Part 3) Applications For The Observations of the Area Committee

With respect to the undermentioned planning applications responses from bodies consulted thereon and representations received from the public thereon constitute background papers with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

ABBREVIATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT

AHEV	-	Area of High Ecological Value
AONB	-	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CA	-	Conservation Area
CLA	-	County Land Agent
EHO	-	Environmental Health Officer
HDS	-	Head of Development Services
HPB	-	Housing Policy Boundary
HRA	-	Housing Restraint Area
LPA	-	Local Planning Authority
LB	-	Listed Building
NFHA	-	New Forest Heritage Area
NPLP	-	Northern Parishes Local Plan
PC	-	Parish Council
PPG	-	Planning Policy Guidance
SDLP	-	Salisbury District Local Plan
SEPLP	-	South Eastern Parishes Local Plan
SLA	-	Special Landscape Area
SRA	-	Special Restraint Area
SWSP	-	South Wiltshire Structure Plan
TPO	-	Tree Preservation Order

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING
COMMITTEE WESTERN AREA 21 AUGUST 2008

Note: This is a précis of the Committee report for use mainly prior to the Committee meeting and does not represent a notice of the decision

Item Page Site Visit	Application No	Parish/Ward Officer Recommendation Ward Councillors
-------------------------------------	-----------------------	--

1	S/2008/0941	HINDON
SV 15:30	Charlie Bruce-White	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
3-6	MR TONY CHUBB SPRINGFIELD CHALKE LANE HINDON SALISBURY	KNOYLE WARD COUNCILLOR FOWLER

Agenda Item : Consultation by North Dorset District Council on two planning applications on land between West Bourton and Whistley Farm, B3081, Gillingham for:

- 1) 6 x 120m high wind turbine generators, construction pads, substation, temporary construction pound, information board and modified vehicular access (their reference number 2/2008/0661).
- 2) 1 x 50m high meteorological monitoring mast for temporary period of 18 months (their reference 2/2008/0671).

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

1

Application Number:	S/2008/0941		
Applicant/ Agent:	A E CHUBB LTD		
Location:	SPRINGFIELD HINDON SALISBURY SP3 6EG		
Proposal:	ERECT REPLACEMENT CHALET BUNGALOW		
Parish/ Ward	HINDON		
Conservation Area:	HINDON	LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	20 May 2008	Expiry Date	15 July 2008
Case Officer:	Charlie Bruce-White	Contact Number:	01722 434682

REASON FOR REPORT TO COMMITTEE

Cllr Fowler has requested that the application be determined by Committee, due to concerns expressed by the Parish Council over the scale of the proposed extensions.

This item was put to the Committee at the July meeting, although it was determined to defer it for the following reasons:

- **To undertake a site visit, predominantly to assist in assessing the impact of the development upon views from the High Street and Conservation Area;**
- **To clarify discrepancies within the submitted drawings over the proposed ridge height increase;**
- **To ascertain whether the extant consent S/2007/1583 can legitimately be built in accordance with approved details.**

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site relates to a bungalow known as Springfield, situated on Chalke Lane, Hindon. Although the bungalow itself is situated outside the Conservation Area, part of the northern end of the site is, and distant views of the bungalow's rear elevation are possible from the High Street. The site is also within the AONB.

THE PROPOSAL

Consent is sought to demolish the existing dwelling and to erect a replacement chalet bungalow.

The application follows on from a recently approved scheme (S/2007/1583) to extend and alter the existing dwelling. Rather than implementing this extant permission, the applicants have decided that demolishing the existing dwelling and erecting a new one to similar footprint, shape, height, finish, etc. would be preferable. The main differences between the current and extant scheme include:

- Omission of a side extension
- Omission of a flat roof dormer
- The increased width of the garage and above bedroom by 200mm
- The increased height of a rear bay window

The ridge height of the proposed dwelling would be no greater than the ridge height permitted within the recently approved scheme. It has been clarified that the ridge height increase would be 620mm over the existing building, and amended plans have been submitted so that all written dimensions on the drawings are consistent. Furthermore, ground level data has been supplied to confirm that the finished floor level of the new dwelling would be the same as the existing one.

PLANNING HISTORY

03/1770 1 ½ storey extension to side with accommodation in roof AC 20.10.03
Western Area Committee 21/08/2008

space. Dormer window to front. Detached garage and rear balcony. New vehicular access.

07/1583

Side & rear extension to replace existing garage, conservatory & utility. Raise ridge line & rear roof slopes to provide additional bedrooms.

AC 17.09.07

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Officer On the basis that this application is essentially identical to the previously approved application, I see no reason to object. The building makes no positive contribution to the conservation area and therefore its demolition is acceptable. I note the Parish Council's concerns, and accept that it will be slightly more visible from the bottom end of the High St, but don't feel that it has a discernibly more negative impact than the current dwelling – it is clearly read as belonging to a distinctly separate area of mid-20th century development.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes
Site Notice displayed	Yes
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes
Third Party responses	No

Parish Council response Object. Reasons include:

- Increased height and width of bungalow would have an adverse impact within the street scene.
- The new rear gable would appear too dominant when viewed from the High Street.
- State that planning decisions should be consistent, and note planning history of adjacent site relating to a new dwelling.

MAIN ISSUES

1. The acceptability of the proposal given the policies of the Local Plan;
2. Character of the locality and amenity of the street scene;
3. Amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and near by property;

POLICY CONTEXT

Local Plan policies G2, H16, D2, C4, C5, CN8, CN11

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Impact upon visual amenity

The extant consent is a material planning consideration within the determination of this application. The main alterations in visual terms would be the omission of a side extension and flat roof dormer window. Both alterations are considered to result in improvements to the overall appearance of the dwelling, resulting in a more balanced and simpler design. Other alterations are of a more minor nature, including the increased width of the garage, alterations to the porch and rear bay window, and are considered to have a neutral impact.

Whilst it is noted that the Parish Council still maintain their objection to the principle of increasing the scale of this dwelling, notwithstanding the extant consent, it is considered there are sound planning reasons why the proposal is acceptable in visual terms. Whilst it is noted that the resulting dwelling would have a higher ridge line than the two dwellings to either side, it is not considered that this would have a detrimental impact upon the appearance of the street scene, since the dwellings are not viewed as a collective group of similar styled dwellings, and the existing street scene's character is very much varied in terms of the scale and design of its buildings. Furthermore, being situated on the lower, northern side of Chalke Lane, it is not considered that the resulting dwelling would appear unduly dominant within the street scene. Information regarding existing and proposed finish floor levels have been provided so that there is no doubt over the height increase proposed, which can subsequently be enforced if necessary.

Regarding views of the dwelling from the Conservation Area, specifically from the High Street, it is noted that distant views are possible, in so far as the dwelling is visible from distances of approximately 150 to 200 metres. The replacement dwelling would be larger and therefore undoubtedly more prominent. However, that is not to say that this increased scale would have an adverse impact if the design is acceptable. Attention is very much drawn to the existing bungalow by a conservatory and a flat roof dormer, which detract from the existing design of the rear elevation of the bungalow. Within the proposed scheme, the appearance of the rear elevation of the dwelling would be improved by the removal of these features, and the introduction of a new gable which, although larger, is of a more appropriate design. Consequently, it is considered that views from the Conservation Area would not be harmed.

The proposals also involve a change from brick to render, with brick quoins being incorporated. Since there is already a variety of materials evident on Chalke Lane, including brick, stone and render, it is not considered that this proposed alteration would be out of keeping with the area. A condition shall be imposed, however, to agree an appropriate colour to the render. It is unlikely that a bright white render would be acceptable given views of the dwelling from the Conservation Area.

Given that the new dwelling would benefit afresh with permitted development rights, it is considered appropriate to remove permitted development rights for extensions to secure that future control can be exercised over the design and scale of the dwelling.

Neighbouring amenity

It is not considered that the proposed extensions would result in any significant overbearing or overshadowing impact upon neighbours. Indeed, the proposal would have a lesser impact upon the dwelling to the east due to the omission of the side extension. The proposed increased width of the garage by 200mm is not considered to be materially more harmful to the neighbour to the west than the extant scheme.

Regarding the maintenance of privacy, compared to existing, there would potentially be some increased overlooking from the first floor window of the gabled rear extension, although for the neighbouring dwelling to the side, any loss of privacy would be restricted to an oblique angle to the far end of the garden, and dwellings to south would not be significantly overlooked due to the distances involved. Compared to the extant scheme, the current proposal would have no greater impact in terms of privacy.

Sustainability issues

The applicant also justifies the merits of the replacement dwelling over the extension option due to the benefits of being able to incorporate eco-features such as underfloor heating from a heat pump, rain water harvesting, and improved insulation. Given the advice contained within national planning policy PPS1: *Sustainability and Climate Change*, such measures are to be encouraged, and it would be possible to secure further details and their implementation through a planning condition.

Relevance of the "fall back" position

The fact that the extant consent could be constructed is a material consideration within the determination of this planning application. Although the applicant's architect has indicated that implementing the extant consent could prove less economically viable, nevertheless, subject to finding no substantial defects in the parts of the existing structure that are to be retained, it has been confirmed by the architect that this scheme can be constructed in accordance with the approved plans and details. It is noted that the extant scheme also included discrepancies within the figured dimensions shown within the drawings, not making it clear whether the ridge height increase would be 620mm or 650mm. However, given the very small margin of error shown, together with the fact that the figured dimensions are stated as approximate, it is not considered that it would be prudent to take enforcement action were this scheme to be built with the ridge height increase between a minimum 620mm and maximum of 650mm.

The relevance of the above is that for any decision of refusal by the Committee to be considered reasonable, it would be necessary to only consider the changes between the extant scheme and the one now proposed, and then justify why these changes are materially harmful so as to make the scheme unacceptable. Given that the scheme now proposed is of a smaller scale and is considered by Officers to present benefits in terms of design and sustainability, the professional advice of Officers is that a refusal would be difficult to defend were the applicant to appeal.

CONCLUSION

The replacement dwelling would be of an appropriate design, scale and appearance, and would not have a significant impact upon the amenity of neighbours or on views from the Conservation Area. Appropriate parking and turning arrangements would be maintained and there would be no adverse impact in highway safety terms. The development would therefore generally accord with the aims and objectives of the development plan.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:

The replacement dwelling would be acceptable in principle, and would not have a significant impact in design or amenity terms, and would not have an unacceptable impact upon views from the Conservation Area.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. This development shall be in accordance with the submitted drawing[s] deposited with the Local Planning Authority on 20/05/08, as amended by the drawing received on 08/08/08 (which clarified discrepancies within the figured dimensions), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
3. Before development is commenced, a schedule of materials and finishes, and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, samples of such materials and finishes, to be used for the external wall[s] and roof[s] of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of the colour of the finished render including any paint to be applied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. The finished floor level of the proposed dwelling shall be in accordance with the details contained within the applicant's letter and plan received on 10/07/08.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A to C of Schedule 2 (Part 1) to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), there shall be no extensions to the dwelling unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a planning application in that behalf.

The reason for the above conditions are listed below:

1. To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. As amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. For the avoidance of doubt.
3. To ensure that the proposed extension will satisfactorily harmonise with the external appearance of the existing building.
4. For the avoidance of doubt.
5. In the interests of visual and neighbouring amenity.

And in accordance with the following policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policy G2	General Development Guidance
Policy D2	Design of infill development
Policy H16	Application of Housing Policy Boundaries
Policy C4	AONB
Policy C5	AONB
Policy CN8	Conservation Areas
Policy CN11	Conservation Areas