REF. NO. C/17/80251

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	C/17/80251
DESCRIPTION	Single and two storey side extensions (to north-eastern elevations), following removal of existing garage, and a one and a half storey rear extension (to north-western elevation) with 2no. side facing dormers and first floor balcony, following removal of existing attached outbuilding. Elevational alterations to north-east including removal of 1no. velux window and enlargement of first floor window
SITE ADDRESS	Bradgate Manor, Abbey Hill, Netley Abbey, Southampton SO31 5FB

SITE VISIT DATE	11/8/17
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	(i) The post-war breeze block garage attached to the NE elevation would be removed. One part of the butterfly/double gable roof (the more central part) would be extended outward by 3.9m (2.35m beyond the other, unchanged, projecting gable part) on two floors. This extension would comprise a new gable with unequal roof planes; that to the north from first floor eaves to a ridge, that on the south from the ridge to ground floor eaves. It would be 5.6m wide and on its rear elevation have fenestration, ground floor glazed door and conjoined upper floor window, from ground to new eaves level. It would also have glazed doors on its north facing elevation. In part stone, part brick- apertures in timber. Roof in slate and clay tiles. (ii) The north 'half' of the north-east elevation (that part not affected by i above) would be extended outwards in a single storey extension 5.25m deep and 6.8m wide. It would have a glazed single plane roof attached to the existing structure at just above the extant first floor windows. It would have extensive glazing on its north elevation and glazed doors along the whole of its rear elevation. (iii) A building attached to the north-west elevation- part flat roofed and part pitched- annotated as 'hayloft' would be demolished. It would be replaced by a new attached building extending outwards 4.7m from the main north elevation. This would be a two storey extension but with the upper floor contained within a large steeply pitched roof with a gable facing north. It would have a double height projection facing east and a first floor balcony facing west.
SITE AREA	1.5ha

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Level
TREES	Extensive mature cover- covered by group TPO
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Wall
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Extensive grounds with large amount of mature peripheral planting.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	This area consists of large secluded premises in extensive plots.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z//31415/001 & L/31415/002	Erection of 2 storey extension	Granted 10/4/90
C/314/003& L/31415/004	Construction of 4 stables and change of use to riding school	Granted 26/5/94
C/31415/007 & L/31415/008	Construction of conservatory	Refused 3/10/95
L/31415/009	Insertion of French windows to kitchen	Granted 22/4/96
C/04/51917	Change of use of outbuilding to training facility	Granted (temporary) 25/10/04
C/05/52933	As above	Granted (temporary) 28/5/05
L/05/55848	Removal of chimney	Granted 9/2/06

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Hound Parish Council	No objection

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
EBC Implementation & Design Officer	Considers the extensions to be *'in the character of the original but suitably subservient to it..'* and that *'The proposals fit well with the original building yet have an identity of their own and present the building as a cohesive whole rather than an elegant original with a collection of basic additions joined on.'* Seeks conditions controlling materials.
EBC Tree Consultant	Notes that there are some significant trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order in close proximity to the proposed development and that no arboricultural documents have been submitted. However

REF. NO. C/17/80251

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	considers that with appropriate conditions that the proposed development is feasible.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Strategic Gap Outside Built-up Area Boundary Within Designated Conservation Area Affects Setting of Listed Building Group TPO Listed Building grade II *1863, in the Butterfield manner. Former vicarage. Two storeys. West front has very steep tile roof with 4 gabled dormers, having cills at eaves level; ground floor has 3 windows (inc. a wide bay at the south end). Walling in grey stone with brick quoins, yellow brick dormer surrounds. Windows are cusped lancets of 2 (dormer), 3, 4 and 6 bay lights, all in wood but imitative of ashlar. Side has gable with single small lights and a yellow brick porch with a Gothic arch. Rear has extension in similar style dated 1919. Chimneys of Tudor style in yellow brick.*

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies 59.BE; 169.LB; 175.LB; 9.CO;19.CO.

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising:

- Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and
- Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014'

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to compliance with adopted countryside policy, the impact of the proposals on the designated heritage asset, amenity and tree protection.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

See main considerations.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATION

N/A

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Policy Context

Within the Local Plan Review the application premises falls within a Strategic Gap and is designated Countryside. Policy 9.CO addresses extensions to dwellings in the countryside and sets out four criteria to be met if permission is to be granted viz.

(i) that there is not an agricultural occupancy condition (which there is not here);

(ii) that the development is not likely to facilitate the subdivision of the property into more than one dwelling- although it would be large enough to accommodate more than one dwelling unit there is nothing in the proposals which appears as signalling such intent;

(iii) that the extension does not result in a building disproportionate to its neighbours or the plot- the building, due to the woodland setting, is not read along with its neighbours and would not be out of character in the conservation area by reason of its relative size. The building is not a modest cottage which might be damaged in historic building terms by extension, but a relatively large building on a fairly large plot;

(iv) that the design of the extension does not worsen the impact of the dwelling on the immediate surroundings or countryside- because of its extensive woodland cover the extension would not be visible from outside the confines of the site.

It is considered in view of the foregoing that countryside policy is not compromised by this proposal. Likewise, because the site is a domestic garden, policy 19.CO which seeks to protect important countryside landscape features is not contravened.

The application premises falls within the Netley Abbey Conservation Area for which an appraisal and management proposals have been published. It includes advice on extensions and seeks, inter alia, that development should use materials traditional to the conservation area adding that non-traditional materials are considered inappropriate.

Amenity

The manor building is over 100m from the nearest habitable space (houses in Abbey Hill) and there is a wide tree belt in the intervening space; there is thus no amenity impact on adjoining premises.

Design & Appearance

Section 74(3) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that Section 66(1) of the Act applies. This indicates that in considering whether to grant Conservation Area consent:

"The Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

In addition, Section 72(1) of the Act states:

"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area of any powers (under the Planning Acts), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."

As the Implementation and Design Officer comments the proposals have an identity of their own and are not an attempt to provide extensions in the Gothic Revival style of the host building, but are

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

otherwise respectful of its proportions whilst adding a fairly large amount of floorspace. In that regard the proposals are considered to comply with policies 169.LB and 175.LB of the Local Plan Review. n.b. internal works are considered in the concurrent listed building consent application report L/17/80250.

Trees

Whilst the applicant suggests in the Design & Access Statement that trees and hedgerows will be unaffected by the proposal it is noted that there are trees in fairly close proximity of the proposed extension at the eastern end of the building. The Council's tree consultant is content that the trees (all protected by a group TPO) can be effectively protected by condition, thus the requested conditions are appended.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

Permit