

Application No: 25/00862FULL Full Application

Site: 15, Chestnut Drive, Ashurst, Southampton SO40 7DW

Proposal: Replacement garage; construction of new outbuilding; store

Applicant: Mr R Holland

Case Officer: Rhian Jones

Parish: Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council

1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Parish Council view

2. POLICIES

Development Plan Designations

Defined New Forest Village
Tree Preservation Order

Principal Development Plan Policies

DP2 General development principles
DP12 Flood risk
DP18 Design principles
DP34 Residential character of the Defined Villages
DP37 Outbuildings
SP15 Tranquillity
SP17 Local distinctiveness

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Guide SPD

NPPF

Sec 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Sec 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

3. MEMBER COMMENTS

None received.

4. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council: Recommend refusal. Comments:
Councillors felt that the building was:

- Contrary to DP2 (e) and SP15 - visual intrusion, particularly to the neighbouring properties;
- DP34 - it does not reflect the locally distinctive character and built heritage of the Defined Village;
- DP37 - it is not incidental to the main dwelling, the store room is being used as a cinema room. Councillors feel that the building is overbearing, particularly due to the proximity to the boundary of no. 14, and, as the dwelling has already had a substantial extension, the site is overdeveloped.

Councillors also wondered if there was any other information about the refusal of planning permission for the garage (NFDC/86/31638) in 1986 – the copy online is very hard to read but mentions refusal due to it being un-neighbourly due to the proximity to the neighbouring property.

5. CONSULTEES

Tree Officer: No objection, subject to withdrawal or amendment of the Arboricultural Assessment report. [The Arboricultural Assessment Report has been subsequently amended to remove tree removal recommendations]

6. REPRESENTATIONS

Two letters of support have been received raising the following points:

- The previous garage had subsidence issues and required replacement.
- The new structures are more appropriate to the setting and cause no harm to neighbours.
- The buildings comply with permitted development height and siting limits.
- The buildings are for incidental domestic use only and not self-contained accommodation.

One letter of objection has been received raising the following points:

- The development is overbearing and results in loss of privacy to no. 14 due to height, raised base, and proximity to the boundary.
- The footprint is significantly larger than the original garage and negatively affects outlook.
- Concern that the buildings are not incidental but capable of future residential use.
- Reference to the 1986 refusal for being unneighbourly, with concern that the site is now overdeveloped.
- The raised base has created concerns about drainage and potential flood risk.

7. RELEVANT HISTORY

Erection of a double garage (NFDC/86/31638) refused on 23 May 1986

8. ASSESSMENT

Application Site

8.1 15 Chestnut Drive is a two-storey detached dwelling constructed in buff brick with a tiled roof, located within the defined New Forest village of Ashurst. The property sits within a small close of similar houses. The rear boundary is formed by protected trees, and the plot widens towards the garden. Ground levels are generally flat.

8.2 The house has been extended to the side and rear under permission 13/99074. Until recently, a detached mono-pitched double garage stood at an angle on the north side of the dwelling. Several small domestic structures, including sheds and a pergola, are also present within the rear garden.

Proposed Development

8.3 The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the removal of the former garage and the construction of a replacement dual-pitched garage, together with a second outbuilding and attached log store. The buildings are positioned further north and east than the previous garage, closer to the northern and eastern boundaries.

8.4 The garage measures circa 3.6 metres to the ridge and is clad in horizontal timber boarding with a tiled roof to match the dwelling. The second outbuilding is flat-roofed, measuring circa 2.48 metres in height, with an attached log store. Both structures are clad in matching timber. The submitted plans describe the use of the garage for vehicle storage and the smaller building for storage and a cinema room.

Consideration

8.5 Policy DP37 permits domestic outbuildings where they are proportionate and clearly subservient to the dwelling they serve; are located within the residential curtilage of an existing dwelling; are required for purposes incidental to the dwelling; are not providing additional habitable accommodation; and whether they will not reduce private amenity space, including parking provision, to an unacceptable level.

8.6 The house remains the visually dominant structure and both buildings have the appearance, scale and form of incidental domestic outbuildings. They sit within the established residential curtilage and are constructed from materials that reflect the character of the main dwelling.

8.7 The use of the buildings are incidental uses and this would be secured by an enforceable planning condition. The footprint of the buildings does not erode usable garden space to a harmful degree and parking arrangements remain unaffected. Overall, the development complies with DP37.

8.8 Chestnut Drive is characterised by detached dwellings with reasonably sized rear gardens and a conventional pattern of domestic outbuildings. The development reflects this pattern. The buildings sit comfortably within the plot, remain clearly secondary to the house and do not alter

the rhythm, spacing or settlement character of the close. The residential character of Ashurst is therefore conserved, and the development complies with Policy DP34.

8.9 Concerns have been raised regarding the height and proximity of the buildings. The larger structure sits approximately 2.6 metres from the boundary with No.14. While the close has a compact layout, this separation is not unusual in a residential setting and does not, in itself, result in an unacceptable overbearing impact. There are no windows on the elevation facing No.14, and the glazing in the doors of the smaller outbuilding faces the garden at ground level. The development would not result in unacceptable adverse impacts in relation to overlooking.

8.10 At circa 3.6 metres to the ridge, the structure is not considered to cause unacceptable overshadowing. The boundary fence between the properties is approximately 1.8 metres high, now with a trellis on top. Further, the protected Scots Pines along the opposite boundary are around 18-20 metres in height and already cast significant shadow. Any additional shading from the outbuilding would be limited. The proposal would not result in unacceptable adverse impacts in relation to shading, in accordance with Policy DP2.

8.11 The Authority's Tree Officer has no objection to the development. Trees on and adjacent to this property are protected by Tree Preservation Order 51/03. The replacement garage / outbuilding has been completed and appears to have been constructed on concrete piles which should have reduced any risk of root severance over traditional strip foundations. The timber building is also unlikely to suffer from subsidence issues as with the previous garage. The originally submitted arboricultural report proposed tree removal for unrelated insurance reasons and has since been amended. There is no tree removal proposed as part of this application.

8.12 A neighbour has raised concern about drainage. The site lies within Environment Agency Flood Zone 1, with a low risk of fluvial flooding. Parts of Chestnut Drive are at risk of surface water flooding. The application states that the design of the building has taken account of future potential flooding through its finished floor levels above ground level.

8.13 Reference has been made to a 1986 refusal for a similar garage. That structure was taller, at 4.5 metres, and was assessed under a different development plan. Limited weight can be attached to that historic decision, and this proposal must be determined on current policies and its own merits.

Conclusion

8.14 The outbuildings accord with Policy DP37. They would not harm the residential character of the defined village, the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, or the tranquillity of the National Park. Permission is recommended subject to conditions as the development would accord

with Policies DP2, DP18, DP34, DP37, SP15 and SP17 of the adopted Local Plan.

9. RECOMMENDATION

Grant Subject to Conditions

Condition(s)

1. The external facing materials to be used in the development shall match those used on the existing building, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the New Forest National Park Authority.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable appearance of the building in accordance with Policy DP2 of the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 - 2036 (August 2019).

2. Development shall only be carried out in accordance with plans:

Proposed Block, Site & Floor Plans (1886-P-02)

No alterations to the approved development shall be made unless otherwise agreed in writing by the New Forest National Park Authority.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable appearance of the building in accordance with Policies SP16, SP17, DP18 and DP2 of the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016- 2036 (August 2019).

3. The buildings the subject of this permission shall only be used for purposes incidental to the dwelling on the site and shall not be used for habitable accommodation such as kitchens, living rooms and bedrooms.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the countryside in accordance with Policies DP36 and DP37 of the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 - 2036 (August 2019).