## **UPDATE PAPER**

# Northern Area Planning Committee

Date: Thursday 25th January 2024

Time: 5.30 p.m.

Venue: Conference Room 1, Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road,

Andover, Hampshire, SP10 3AJ



### Northern Area Planning Committee – 25<sup>th</sup> January 2024 Update Paper

The purpose	of the report is	to provide i	nformation	on planning	applications	which h	as
been receive	ed since the age	nda was pr	inted.				

Report of Head of Planning and Building

#### 1. Background

1.1 Reports on planning applications are prepared for printing on the agenda some 10 days before the date of the Committee meeting but information and representations received after that time are relevant to the decision. This paper contains such information which was received before 10.00am on the date of the meeting. Any information received after that time is reported verbally.

#### 2. Issues

2.1 Information and representations are summarized but the full text is available on the relevant file should Members require more details. The paper may contain an officer comment on the additional information, amended recommendations and amended and/or additional conditions.

#### 7. <u>23/03062/FULLN (REFUSE) 30.11.2023</u>

13 - 20

SITE: 37 Bishops Way, Andover, SP10 3EH

ANDOVER TOWN (MILLWAY)

**CASE OFFICER:** Claudia Hurlock

#### 8. <u>23/03029/FULLN (PERMISSION) 28.11.2023</u>

21 - 25

SITE: 3 Shepherds Rise, Vernham Dean, SP11 0HD

**VERNHAM DEAN** 

**CASE OFFICER:** Claudia Hurlock

**APPLICATION NO.** 23/03062/FULLN

SITE 37 Bishops Way

Andover

Hampshire

**SP10 3EH** 

**COMMITTEE DATE** 25<sup>th</sup> January 2024

ITEM NO. 7

**PAGE NO.** 13 - 20.

#### 1.0 VIEWING PANEL

1.1 A Viewing Panel was undertaken at the site on the 24<sup>th</sup> January 2024. Those Councillors attending the Viewing Panel were: Councillors Budzynski, Brooks, Gregori and Lodge.

1.2 Apologies were received from Councillors Andersen, Linda Lashbrook, Philip Lashbrook and Kirsty North.

#### 2.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

2.1 Following the Viewing Panel on 24.01.2024, a discussion took place with the Council's Arboricultural Manager in relation to the likely effect of the proposed development on the site's north-western boundary hedge located within the rear garden of No. 39 Bishops Way. He has subsequently confirmed in an email that:

"The proposed two storey extension will cause the hedge to be shaded this will have a detrimental effect on the hedge as it will be deprived of light and its future growth is likely to be suppressed."

#### 3.0 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Since the publication of the Agenda report, a further supporting statement from the applicants has been received. This is summarised as follows:

- There are other neighbouring 2 storey extensions which were granted permission under delegated powers.
- Nothing is proposed within this scheme which is dissimilar to neighbouring properties.
- The proposed front gable feature is in keeping with other properties and the street scene.
- Planning officer recommendation made without a site visit.
- Number 37 is the smallest house on the road.
- 3.2 Since the upload of the main agenda report, 5 x letters in support of the application have been received from:

49 Paddock Gardens Lymington, 27 Dollis Drive Farnham, 12 Bishops Way, 14 Whynot Lane (two letters), summarised as follows:

- Neighbouring properties have been extended at two storey level at the rear.
- Site visit not undertaken by case officer.
- 3 previous pre-apps have demonstrated that efforts have been made to mitigate concerns.
- Gable is in keeping with the street scene.
- The design of the proposal does not jeopardise the character of the RASC.
- Overbearing is not an issue in this context as the gardens are SSW facing.
- Proposal is consistent with other relevant recent developments and a precedent has been set.
- Plans bear no resemblance to the actual location.

Number 41 was allowed to extend beyond number 39.

#### 4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 4.1 The Arboricultural Manager's comments in section 2 above highlight the likely impact that the proposal would have on the boundary hedge between the application site and No. 39. This means that the existing hedge cannot be relied upon to create any kind of screen for the occupants of this adjoining property and therefore adds further weight to the concerns regarding the impact of the scheme on neighbouring amenity.
- 4.2 The further representations considered above in section 3 have been taken into account but do not alter the findings made in the officer recommendation in the Agenda Report. The case officer has visited the site on a total of 3 occasions to visit the site and neighbouring property.

4.3 The proposed development is considered to be unreasonably harmful the amenity of adjoining occupants and to the character and appearance of the Residential Area of Special Character and as such is recommended for Refusal.

#### 5.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

#### **REFUSE**

- 1. The proposed two storey gable extension at the front of the property would unbalance the existing proportions and distinctiveness of the front elevation of the house. Furthermore the proposal would form an unduly dominant feature within the street scene and harm the character of the Andover Residential Area of Special Character where dwellings in this area are generally of modest appearance and proportions. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies E1 and E4 of the TVBRLP.
- 2. The proposed development would by reason of its bulk and mass and proximity to the neighbouring property, visually dominate and result in an unacceptable loss of outlook to the primary outside amenity space of No. 39 Bishops Way. The proposal therefore is contrary to Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

**APPLICATION NO.** 23/03029/FULLN

**SITE** 3 Shepherds Rise

Vernham Dean

Andover

Hampshire

**SP11 0HD** 

**COMMITTEE DATE** 25<sup>th</sup> January 2024

ITEM NO. 8

**PAGE NO.** 21-25

#### 4.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATION**

4.1 In paragraphs 2.1 and 8.4 of the report, a boundary wall is referred to. This should be referred to as a boundary fence.