

ITEM 7

APPLICATION NO.	18/00814/FULLN
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
REGISTERED	26.03.2018
APPLICANT	Mr R and Ms C Munnery and Norton
SITE	The Cottage, Cow Lane, Kimpton, SP11 8NY, KIMPTON
PROPOSAL	Two storey side extension to form enlarged entrance hall, utility room and cloakroom with en-suite bathroom over and first floor rear extension to form bedroom, removal of existing part thatched roof and reduction in chimney height
AMENDMENTS	Drawing: 873 / 05 Sight Lines received 24.05.2018
CASE OFFICER	Mrs Donna Dodd

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to Northern Area Planning Committee at the request of a local ward member because it raises issues of more than local public interest.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The host property is a two storey semi-detached property sited adjacent to Cow Lane, with Cobweb Cottage, the adjoining property, situated to the north-west. The property has been extended to the rear and side. The main walls of the property are finished with a painted render, with the side extension clad with timber. The roof of the cottage is part thatch and part tiled, with the tiled roof matching the height and design of the roof of Cobweb Cottage. The roof of the side extension is finished with tiles and the rear extension is constructed with a flat roof.

3.0 PROPOSAL

The proposal is to erect a two-storey side extension to form an enlarged entrance hall, utility room and cloakroom with en-suite bathroom over and a first floor rear extension to form an additional bedroom. The proposal would also result in the removal of the thatched roof section, which would be replaced with tiles to match the host property and Cobweb Cottage.

4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 None relevant.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 **Highways – no objection.**

- 5.2 **Ecology – no objection subject to informative.**

5.3 **Design and Conservation – comment:**

The original cottage appears to be of some age – it is shown on the Victorian OS maps, however, it is not listed and it is not in a conservation area.

It is appreciated that the building has been substantially altered, and the current arrangement and appearance is not successful. It is unlikely that it would be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. In order to form a more homogenous building a relatively drastic approach, such as proposed, may be needed.

That said, Design and Conservation would not generally support the removal of thatch, to be replaced with some other material, whether the building in question is designated or not, or whether it is historic or modern. Thatch is an important part of the character of Test Valley generally, and therefore the tradition should be promoted.

Design and Conservation - Additional comments received 26.06.2018

The site is outside of the conservation area, and is separated from it by modern dwellings, therefore it is not considered it forms part of the setting of the conservation area. The proposed alterations will not, therefore have any adverse impact on the special interest of the conservation area.

The site also does not fall within the settings of any listed buildings.

With the exception of April Cottage to the north, Cow Lane is essentially comprised of modern dwellings, and it does not significantly contribute to the character of the historic village. The historic context which these two cottages once had, as being isolated dwellings well outside of the village core, has been obliterated by the 20thC development around them, both along Cow Lane and Deacon Road.

April Cottage, also unlisted, is a better example of a thatched cottage than The Cottage, retaining much more of its character and form, and without so many obvious alterations and additions. It is an attractive building with a homogenous appearance, which The Cottage, currently, is not.

The Cottage is not considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, as, though parts of it are historic, it has been significantly altered, is not an attractive building, and does not contribute significantly to the historic environment.

For the above reasons it is considered the proposed development complies with the requirements of Policy E9 of the RLP.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 25.04.2018

6.1 **Kimpton Parish Council - Objection.**

The proposed building will impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The new building is within 2.5 meters of Afon and will dominate the surrounding buildings. The proposed size will overpower the neighbour;

considerably reduce their light and any privacy. The proposed bedroom window will overlook, Rustlets and Afon and look straight down into their garden removing any privacy they have enjoyed to date. The suggested soft landscaping at the rear garden as additional screening cannot be relied on as shown in after planning care from previous local projects.

The proposed building will impact on the existing dwelling.

There are very few thatched properties in the village and they should be preserved, they are part of our village heritage. It is our understanding that Hampshire's policy was any extension to a thatch property should not replicate the original thatched roof and that an original thatch should not be removed because the owner does not like it any more. When you read the bat survey report the thatch is in excellent condition, to quote "very tight to the wall structure and good wire netting". Nobody buys a thatch property without going into the ramifications of repairing it or replacing it-so to state. In the design statement that 'future and ongoing maintenance exceeds the project's budget' should have been considered before the cottage was purchased. It also refers to it as 'the unsightly thatched section' and its removal would allow for 'the removal of a large and extremely prominent flue'. These are just excuses to try and justify the removal of the thatch.

The proposed building will impact the character of the surrounding area.

The Cottage is an established part of the northern part of the Village. It is one of only two existing thatched cottages in the northern area. The building dates back to early 19th century (see attached photo). The design of the proposed application removes the existing thatch which has been surveyed and is in good condition. The previous application (07/02151/FULLN) was for a single storey building. The proposed two storey dwelling will be the largest in the area and overshadow the adjacent buildings.

Construction.

Any construction works at the proposed building will impact on the access to Cow Lane (SP11 8NY). The road is single lane traffic. There is little or no space for any form of construction equipment, scaffolding etc. Any lay-down area for materials would impact on both the direct neighbours (Afon) and the Cow Lane access.

History of The Cottage.

In addition a photo from the early 1900 of The Cottage is attached. It shows the original thatched roof, the important position of The Cottage in the village and its history as an integral part of the village.

Car Parking

The car parking facilities at The Cottage are confined to two very small areas. The owner presently parks their third car in the Kimpton Village Hall parking area. The proposed new build would not add any additional parking if further parking was required.

6.2 **2 x letters of objection –**

Afon, Cow Lane, Kimpton (summarised):

- *The Cottage occupies a prominent position on Cow Lane and represents both a historical and village landmark being only one of two thatched cottages at this end of the village.*
- *The application seeks to destroy the character of the property by removing the thatch and developing beyond recognition.*
- *Large-scale and size will swamp both neighbouring properties.*
- *Proposed extension to the east and south is only 8 feet away from Afon, encroaching on privacy.*
- *Adversely impact our property from a visual prospective*
- *Loss of light, overshadowing and reduction in light levels*
- *Destroys any views to the village from the rear of our property*
- *Total overdevelopment and not in keeping with the character of the village*
- *Proposal is not in line with any of TVBC planning considerations*

Rustlets, Cow Lane, Kimpton (summarised):

- *Loss of secluded garden*
- *Occupants of the upstairs bedroom would have a perfect view straight across our property.*

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(TVBRLP)

Policy COM2 – Settlement Hierarchy

Policy E1- High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E5 - Biodiversity

Policy LHW4 – Amenity

Policy T2 – Parking Standards

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on amenity of neighbouring property
- Impact on ecology
- Impact on parking provision

8.2 **Principle of development**

The site lies within the Kimpton settlement boundary as defined on the Inset Maps of the TVBRLP. In accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP development is permitted provided the proposal is appropriate to other policies of the Revised Local Plan. The proposal is assessed against relevant policies below.

8.3 Impact on the character and appearance of the area

The proposed two-storey side extension would be located in a position close to the adjacent highway. The rear extension would also be visible from Cow Lane through the gap between the host property and Afon to the south-west.

8.4 As detailed within the comments of the Conservation Officer, thatch is an important part of the character of Test Valley, and therefore the tradition should be promoted. However, the building has significantly evolved overtime including the addition of side and rear extensions, fenestration changes and alterations to the thatch, and it is considered that in the particular circumstances of this application The Cottage does not contribute significantly to the historic environment of Kimpton.

8.5 The existing thatched roof contributes to the character of the host property. However, the existing property is defined by a mixture of building styles, form and materials and which have resulted from previous extensions/alterations to the property. Within this particular context the proposed development would therefore result in a neutral impact on the appearance of the property within the street scene.

8.6 The alterations to the roof would include the removal of the large and prominent flue, which would benefit the appearance of the host property. The removal of the thatch would reduce the height of the roof making the flue more prominent and incongruous, therefore, it is considered that a condition is necessary to ensure the removal of the flue is secured.

8.7 It is also noted that replacement of the thatch with tiles on the existing dwelling would be development permitted by The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 and as such could be undertaken without the requirement for planning permission. As such, there is a fall-back position whereby the thatch could be removed from the existing dwelling, and this is a material planning consideration.

8.8 Concerns have been raised by a local resident and the Parish Council regarding the overdevelopment of the site. There are a mixture of property and garden sizes along Cow Lane and it is considered that the addition of the proposed extensions on a similar footprint within a plot of this size would not appear as overdevelopment or incongruous.

8.9 As a result of the neutral impact of the loss of the thatch, the removal of the flue and the fall-back position that the thatch could be removed without the requirement for planning permission, it is considered that the proposed extension is acceptable and would integrate, respect and complement the character of the host property and the area, in compliance with Policy E1 of the RLP.

8.10 Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties

The neighbouring properties most affected by the proposals are Cobweb Cottage, Afon and Rustlets.

8.11 **Cobweb Cottage**

Loss of light

The proposal would result in an additional shadow being cast over the neighbouring property Cobweb Cottage during the early morning. The shadow would be cast for a short period and would affect the neighbour's rear first-floor bedroom window. The whole of the rear of the property and the garden would still receive sunlight for the rest of the day. It is considered that the additional shadowing would be minimal and would not reduce the level of sunlight reaching the neighbour to fall below acceptable levels.

8.12 Outlook

The rear extension would not project a significant distance beyond the rear building line of Cobweb Cottage. Due to the distance and juxtaposition of Cobweb Cottage to the proposed extension, it is considered that the level of openness and outlook enjoyed by these current occupants would largely remain unaffected by the proposed scheme.

8.13 Privacy

The boundary treatment between the host property and Cobweb Cottage consists of high-level fencing and mature planting. Any oblique views from the proposed rear windows would be largely screened by the boundary treatments. The two modestly sized roof lights would introduce new views to the rear garden of Cobweb Cottage; however, these views would be largely obscured by the mature planting and would be directed towards the less sensitive areas of this garden.

8.14 **Afon**

Loss of light

The neighbour to the south-west, Afon, is a modern detached dwelling for which permission was granted in 2010 (10/02076/FULLN). It is noted that the occupiers of Afon have raised concerns about loss of light, overshadowing and reduction in light levels. The proposed extension would be sited north-east of Afon. Consequently any additional shading caused by the proposal would be to the north of that property which would not result in any unacceptable harm.

8.15 Outlook

The proposed extensions would be separated from Afon by approximately 2.5 metres. The proposed side extension would be in line with the side elevation of Afon on the same footprint as the existing single-storey side extension, and the occupiers would retain views through the separation gap to Cow Lane. The side extension would be approximately 2m from the closest first floor front window of Afon, which is the only window to a bedroom. It would affect the outlook from this window but the part hipped and part catslide roof design mean that it would not be a particularly bulky addition when seen from that window. There would still be open views to the front and the south from the bedroom window. The nearest ground floor front window serves a sitting room which also has a window at the rear. The proposed side extension would be in a similar position to the existing single storey extension and whilst it would be taller, it is not considered that it would have a significant impact on the outlook from that

window. There are no windows in the facing flank of Afon. It is considered that due to the separation gap and the remaining outlook to the front and rear of Afon, the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact for these occupiers.

8.16 Privacy

The proposed first floor rear extension includes a new first-floor bedroom window and roof light in the rear elevation/roof slope. It is considered that the proposed bedroom window in close proximity to the neighbouring boundary would introduce new views into the rear garden of the neighbouring properties at Afon and Rustlets. Afon has a modestly sized rear garden with the patio immediately behind the dwelling on an area laid to paving. It is considered that the modest scale of the window and the extended eaves overhang would help to reduce the extent of possible views from this window across this neighbouring garden. The proposed planting (to be secured by condition) would also help to screen the views to the gardens of Afon and Rustlets; however, the retention of such planting cannot be secured in perpetuity as it is living matter. Any oblique views from the proposed first-floor window would be to the far west corner of Afon's garden, away from the occupier's patio area where the occupants might reasonably be expected to sit out. As such, it is considered that there would be a degree of overlooking limited to the western corner of the garden which would be at an insufficient level to warrant a reason for refusal.

8.17 Rustlets

Light and outlook

The proposal would not result in the loss of light, overshadowing or an overbearing impact to Rustlets due to the modest design and the distances between the properties.

8.18 Privacy

Rustlets is situated to the rear of the site and is approximately 25 metres from the proposed rear extension and rear first-floor window. It is considered that the distance between properties in addition to the screening provided by the existing planting would provide for the privacy of the occupiers of Rustlets and the host property.

8.19 Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to an adverse impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring properties sufficient to withhold permission. As such the proposal complies with policy LHW4 of the RLP.

8.20 Impact on ecology

Following the submission of a bat survey and the subsequent consultation response from the County Ecologist, it is considered that the proposal does not give rise to any adverse impacts on existing habitat or on-site ecology and is therefore in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

8.21 Impact on parking provision

It is noted that Kimpton Parish Council has raised concern about the current parking facilities at The Cottage and the inability to add any additional parking.

It is recognised that the current parking is limited on site; however, the proposal does not give rise to additional demand for car parking or result in the loss of existing car parking spaces to serve the dwelling. The parking standard for a three-bedroom property is two parking spaces and the existing and proposed parking provision provides for this requirement. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the parking standards as set out in Annex G and Policy T2 of the RLP.

8.22 Other

Concerns have been raised by Kimpton Parish Council about the construction of the proposal and the impact this could have on the neighbouring property and to the access of Cow Lane. It is considered that there is sufficient space within the curtilage of The Cottage for the storage of building materials during the construction period. Any impact on the highway would be covered by other legislation and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate these controls with a planning condition.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposals are considered acceptable, as they would integrate, respect and complement the character of the area. The privacy and amenity of the occupants and the neighbours would be provided for. The proposal is in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policies COM2, E1, LHW4, E5 and T2.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

PERMISSION subject to:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**
2. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan, number 873/02B.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
3. **No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until details of the tree as marked on the approved plan 873/02B, including the species and planting size, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The planting shall be carried out before the end of the current or first available planting season following completion of the development. The tree shall be maintained to encourage its establishment for a minimum period of five years following completion of the development. Should the tree be removed, die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective within this period, it shall be replaced before the end of the current or first available planting season following the failure, removal or damage of the tree.**

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining occupiers in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LWH4.

- 4. Before any part of the development hereby approved is brought into use, the proposed flue as detailed on drawing 873/02 B shall be removed.**

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policies E1 and LHW4.

Note to Applicant:

- 1. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. TVBC work with applicants and their agents in a positive and proactive manner offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of issues that may arise in dealing with the application and where possible suggesting solutions.**
-