

REPORT OUTLINE FOR AREA PLANNING COMMITTEES**Report No.**

Date of Meeting	14 June 2017
Application Number	17/03280/FUL
Site Address	Daisy Cottage 26 A High Street Sutton Benger SN15 4RF
Proposal	Proposed detached single garage (Resubmission of 17/00850/FUL)
Applicant	Mr Simon Ellinger
Town/Parish Council	SUTTON BENDER
Electoral Division	KINGTON –Councillor Howard Greenman
Grid Ref	394467 178684
Type of application	Full Planning
Case Officer	Louisa Haines

Reason for the application being considered by Committee:

The application has been called to Committee by the Local Member, Councillor Howard Greenman, in order for the *“committee to consider environmental impact, size and scale. I have every belief that this will be taken to appeal if it is refused, and would be more comfortable with the outcome if there had been a committee decision too.”*

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of the report is to assess the proposal against the policies of the development plan and other material considerations and to consider the recommendation that the application be refused.

2. Report Summary

The main issues in the consideration of the above application are as follows:

- The principle of the development.
- The impact of the proposal on the Sutton Benger Conservation Area
- The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the application site
- The impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of surrounding properties.

At the time of recommendation, objections have been received from Sutton Benger Parish Council, the Conservation Officer and a local resident.

3. Site Description

The application relates to a new build detached house, which is one of two built on the site of the old post office in Sutton Benger. The house sits on the main high street of Sutton Benger within the conservation area. The houses along this part of the conservation area front the highway with the principal elevation and garages are to the side of the property. On the surrounding dwellings to Daisy Cottage the properties have a drive fronting the road. Daisy cottage has a similar driveway currently consented. The dwellings on the opposite side of the road are similar but with shorter driveways and a stone wall between the driveway and the pavement, garages are again to the side of the property. This maintains a distinctive street scene along the road.

4. Planning History

N/12/04032/FUL	Proposed front extension, raise roof, alter windows and change external wall material to render- related to post office and some additional residential.	Approve with conditions
N/13/00835/FUL	Principle of additional housing was considered acceptable, but refused as the post office was still a functioning shop. A change to introduce a parking area was considered to be significant but not harmful to the conservation area as the 6 dwellings to the East had similar front driveways.	Refuse
14/04152/FUL	Amendments to 12/04032/FUL to subdivide into 2 dwellings and new access (resubmission of 13/00835/FUL)	Approve with conditions
16/01606/PREAPP	Two new dwellings and Demolition of Existing Dwelling	Pre-application advice
16/03211/FUL	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two new dwellings. This is the current permission under which Daisy Cottage is being built. The main dwellings have now been externally constructed.	Approve with conditions 31.05.2016
17/00850/FUL	Proposed Detached Single Garage	Refuse 24.03.2017

5. The Proposal

This application seeks permission for a proposed single detached garage to the front of Daisy Cottage, this will replace one of the parking spaces already consented. This is a resubmission of 17/00850/FUL which was refused. This application proposes a minor change to the design of the roof with the garage remaining sited in the same location to the front of the dwelling.

The garage considered in this application is proposed at Daisy Cottage. Daisy Cottage is a newly built house, built under 16/03211/FUL as one of two dwellings. Pre-application advice was sought for Daisy cottage and the neighbouring dwelling. The parking put forward by the applicant for both the pre-application and application, did not show a garage at Daisy

Cottage. There is parking, including subsequently a garage, to the rear of the other dwelling. The Conservation Officer would have preferred parking for both properties to be at the rear but the applicants preferred the front access and parking for Daisy Cottage, (front access had been previously consented in 14/04152/FUL).

6. Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Paragraphs 14 and 17; and Section 7 paragraphs 58, 60, 61, and 64; and Section 12 paragraphs 128, 129, 131, 132, 134 and 137

Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS):

Core Policy 1: Settlement Strategy

Core Policy 57: Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping

Core Policy 58: Ensuring the Conservation of the Historic Environment

7. Summary of consultation responses

Sutton Benger Parish Council – Object 1. *The proposed development, by reason of its design and location fails to conserve the character of the Conservation Area. This harm is not otherwise justified by any wider public benefit.....* 2. *The proposed development, by reason of its scale, mass and siting within a residential garden and design would fail to integrate into the existing built context and pattern of development. Therefore, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities and character of the surrounding area*

Conservation Officer- Object. Same reasons as highlighted by the Parish Council above and in addition *'The principle of a detached garage structure would remain an alien and incongruous feature in the streetscape. The applicants agent cites a previous application as setting a precedent for such structures. Examining the impact this previous decision it is clear that it causes an adverse effect on the views along High Street.....The adverse effects in this situation are caused by the non-characteristic form of service buildings to the fore of domestic dwellings. In the Sutton Benger Conservation typically Buildings are recessed from the road behind gardens and planting. Where car parking exists within the forecourts predominantly it is surface parking surrounded by planting.'*

Local resident- Object. *This change to the materials used to construct the single garage does not overcome the key issuesNo other building along this side of the High Street has a garage in front of it and it would therefore seem to be detrimental to the overall look of this part of the conservation area (noting that without the garage the developers have made the new builds integrate very well into the surrounding houses) ...The comparison to another house along the High Street is fatuous – in that development there was little opportunity to build a garage behind the house – and it should be noted that on this site the developer had ample space to construct a suitable arrangement of garages behind both houses but chose not to do so. Instead there was a clear focus on providing one double garage for one house in the original planning application and presumably they hoped to gain a subsequent approval for an unsightly addition to the other house.*

8. Publicity

The application was advertised by an advert placed in the Wiltshire Gazette and Herald, a site notice and direct neighbour notification letters. One letter of objection was received from a local resident.

9. Planning Considerations

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Sections 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require Local Planning Authorities in determining planning applications affecting a Listed Building or Conservation Area to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that conservation area.

Principle:

The principle of a detached garage within the residential curtilage of a dwelling in Sutton Benger is established under Core Policy 1 and Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The proposed garage is within the conservation area so Core Policy 58 must also be considered as must relevant national legislation and guidance as highlighted above.

Effect on the Conservation Area and Street Scene

There would be harm caused. This is assessed as less than substantial harm but it is considered that this harm is not outweighed by any public benefit.

Core Policy 57 requires development to enhance local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the historic environment. Core Policy 58 states development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment, which includes the special character or appearance of conservation areas. This reflects the guidance given in paragraphs 126 and 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework and in paragraph 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990.

Core Policy 57 states a high standard of design is required in all new developments. New developments should relate positively to the existing pattern of development and take account of the characteristics of the site and the local context to deliver an appropriate development which relates effectively to the immediate setting and to the wider character of the area. The government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment as laid out in section 7 of the NPPF, including the need to respond to local character and history as set out in paragraph 58.

The central area of the village including the High Street in Sutton Benger is designated as a Conservation Area, in relation to its historic, evidential and interpretive significance and the communal value in that regard. Daisy cottage currently has permission for three parking spaces at the front of the property granted under 16/03211/FUL. This would maintain the open frontage to the principal elevation which is characteristic of this part of the conservation area. The proposed single detached garage would sit between the front of the dwelling and the highway; this is uncharacteristic in this part of the conservation area and would not accord with the historic built form and historic significance of the area. Harm would be caused to the character and distinctiveness of the conservation area therefore this application is not in accordance with the principles outlined above in CP57 and CP58 or with national planning policy.

As set out in the NPPF where harm is identified in a conservation area its significance must be considered and if it is found that less than substantial harm would occur, this must then be weighed against any public benefits gained from the proposal. The small scale of the proposal, being for a single detached garage within a residential curtilage, and with the

impact relating to the character and appearance of the conservation area means the identified harm in this case is considered to be less than substantial. The proposed garage is purely for the residents of Daisy Cottage. Daisy Cottage already has adequate existing off street parking providing by application 16/03211/FUL, there is no additional requirement and there are no additional spaces provided by this application as one parking space would be lost to allow for the garage, therefore there is no public benefit gained from this application.

It is proposed to locate the garage in a particularly prominent position in the street scene as it has been located in the far south corner of the plot, not in close proximity to any other dwellings including the host dwelling. This further adds to the adverse impact. However, it is not considered there is any location to the front of the property where a garage would be acceptable so an alternative location has not been discussed with the applicant.

The proposal shows some hedges on the plan, around the proposed garage and between the dwellings. Although this would help to partially mitigate the visual impact of the garage it would still not remove the less than substantial harm that a detached garage to the front of principal elevation in this location would have on the character and distinctiveness of the conservation area, as described above.

The applicants have sent in pictures and information of a detached double garage at 11B on the High Street within the conservation area in support of their application. Although the application must be considered on its own merits the Case Officer did view this development and also discussed it with the Conservation Officer. 11B is in reasonably close proximity, however it is located around a corner within an area that has more of a mix of building types and dwelling frontages. Directly opposite 11B is a stone dwelling that is positioned next to the highway and there is a detached outbuilding which is adjacent to the pavement. There is also a pub and some other buildings set back from the road. A detached garage therefore does not have the same level of harm in this location. It does however show how the open nature of the frontage is not maintained by having a garage at the front of the property and the Conservation Officer also felt this was actually a good example of why a garage in front of Daisy Cottage would not be appropriate.

Sutton Benger Parish Council has objected to the proposal as they consider it fails to conserve the character of the conservation area and the proposal would not integrate into the existing built environment.

One local resident has also objected to the proposed garage as it would be detrimental to the conservation area. They put forward that the developer has made the original houses integrate well and that the developer had the opportunity to consider a garage for Daisy Cottage under that application.

Effect on appearance of application site

The garage is of a fairly typical design. It is proposed as a single storey detached building with a hipped roof to be clad in Bradstone conservation roofing slate and timber cladding and reconstituted stone. There has been a minor design change in terms of roof style from the previous submission refused under application 17/00850/FUL, but it is not considered that this amendment has addressed the identified concerns and harmful impact of the proposed development.

Daisy cottage has been built using pale beige stone and roof tiles, therefore these elements of the proposed garage appear to match, however, the host dwelling does not have timber cladding. Although timber cladding is an often utilised material for outbuildings it is not in keeping with the host dwelling and as the garage is proposed in such a prominent position in the conservation area it is considered that the design would not accord with CP57 which

requires materials to effectively integrate the building into its setting. Discussions on changing this have not been undertaken as it is considered a garage at the front of this dwelling is not appropriate in principle due to the detrimental impact on the character and distinctiveness of the conservation area as described above.

Highways

The access to the property remains in the same place as the previous permission, and the total amount of parking also remains unchanged, (the proposed garage meets the minimum dimensions required to provide an off road space). The Highways Officer feels the proposed application for a single garage still leaves sufficient space for turning and therefore there is no significant adverse effect from the proposal.

Effect on Amenity of Neighbours

The proposed garage is situated to the front of the property by the boundary wall. It is not in close proximity to either of the residential buildings adjoining the site and therefore it is not considered to have an adverse effect on the amenity of the surrounding properties. In relation to the host dwelling, the proposed location provides a reasonable sized gap that should ensure the garage does not reduce the amenity for future occupiers in terms of loss of daylight or having a detrimental impact by virtue of being overbearing.

Conclusion

The above assessment has shown that the development would cause less than substantial harm to the character and distinctiveness of the conservation area as it will have a detrimental effect on the distinctive frontage pattern. This harm is not outweighed by any public benefit. The application is therefore not in accordance with Wiltshire Core Strategy Policies 57 and 58. NPPF paragraph 17; and Section 7 paragraphs 58, 60 61 and 64; and Section 12 paragraphs 131 132, 134 and 137 and Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 paragraph 72 (1). The materials currently proposed are also not in keeping with the host dwelling. This application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission is REFUSED, for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its design and location fails to conserve the character of the Conservation Area. This harm is not otherwise justified by any wider public benefit. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy 57 (i) and 58 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paragraphs 17, 58, 131, 132, 134, and 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework.