



Legend

Scale:



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Winchester City Council © 2007.

Organisation	Winchester City Council
Department	Developmentt Services
Comments	
Date	12 May 2010
SLA Number	00018301

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA**

Item No: 10
Case No: 10/00102/FUL / W21692
Proposal Description: Replacement of two no. existing bungalows with two no. 2 bed eco-homes, landscaping and associated works
Address: Fisher Bungalow Alresford Road Winchester Hampshire SO21 1HL
Parish, or Ward if within Winchester City: Itchen Valley
Applicants Name: Greentithe
Case Officer: Elaine Walters
Date Valid: 18 January 2010
Site Factors: National Park
Countryside
Civil Aviation
Recommendation: Application Refused

General Comments

This application is reported to Committee at the request of Itchen Valley Parish Council, whose request is appended in full to this report.

Site Description

The site lies north of the Morn Hill caravan club, east of the Percy Hobbs pub on the A31 Alresford Road roundabout, approximately 3 miles east of Winchester city centre.

The site area measures 0.45Ha. Vehicle access is via a 200m long drive, which runs through the caravan club site.

On site are two single storey, two bedroom, flat roof bungalows which date from 1954, they each measure 68 sq.m. The dwelling on the left hand side viewed from the access is named Fisher bungalow and on the right is Hobbs bungalow. They were erected as farm workers' dwellings for Pitt Farm, which lies to the north east, but are no longer tied agricultural dwellings.

There is a substantial grassed area to the front of the cottages, with some mature shrubs lining the access road. To the south there is a further 0.2Ha grassed area which is not included in the site area.

The caravan site lies to the south, with open farmland on the remaining three sides. Boundaries are marked by post and wire 1m high fences with largely open views across farmland. There are some shrubs and trees along the southern boundary with the caravan club, some low shrubs along the western boundary of the site and to the north west of the site there is a clump of mature trees, on the site of a previous pair of dwellings, which fell down approximately 20 years ago, with only some evidence of walls and foundations remaining.

The site lies just outside the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but within the South Downs National Park.

On site, both dwellings have the concrete foundations in place for single storey side extensions. A Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Development has been granted which confirms that the proposed extensions would be within current permitted development rights, therefore planning permission would not be necessary to complete the extensions.

Ground levels rise by approximately 3m from the south to the north of the site.

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA**

Proposal

It is proposed to demolish the existing dwellings and erect two new, timber clad, flat roof, two bedroom dwellings. House 2 will be positioned 32m further north on site than the existing buildings but it will stand on the footprint of the previously demolished dwelling here.

The applicant states the dwellings will achieve code 5 on the Code for Sustainable Homes. The dwellings are also described as live work units with a home office proposed in each unit.

Means of access is as existing with a proposed realignment of the access and parking area in front of the new dwellings to move it further south and closer to the site boundary. Density would remain as existing at 4 dwellings per Ha.

Relevant Planning History

90/01819/OLD - W/12001 Pitt Farm bungalows. 4no. replacement dwellings. Refused August 1990

93/01078/OLD - W/12001/05 Pitt Farm bungalows. Repairs to two dwellings. Refused January 1993

LDC/149 Sought to establish that residential use had not been abandoned and therefore permitted development rights were applicable. Granted September 1994

00/01422/FUL - W/12001/07 Pitt Farm bungalows. Replace flat roofs with pitched roofs. Permitted. September 2000

05/02016/FUL - W/12001/08 Pitt Farm bungalows. Replace flat roof with pitched roofs on 2 No: bungalows (renewal of planning permission W12001/07) Permitted October 2005.

09/02613/LDP - LDC/149/01 Rear and side extensions and ancillary outbuilding to existing dwellings at Fisher and Hobbs Bungalows (CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS). Permitted March 2010

Consultations

Engineers: Drainage:

Consult the Environment Agency as non-mains drainage is proposed. A septic tank is proposed but a treatment system is preferable for ecological reasons regarding effluent impact on the aquatic environment. Condition details of foul and surface drainage.

Engineers: Highways:

Adequate parking is provided and the existing access is to be used therefore acceptable.

Environmental Health:

A condition is suggested to deal with unexpected contamination.

Landscape:

Recommend refusal.

There are views out into the countryside along the eastern and northern boundaries and glimpsed long distance views into this site.

Development in the National Park is to be of the highest standard. Whilst the scheme is of positive, contemporary design and adhering to Code for Sustainable Homes standards, the proposed footprints of the bungalows are much larger than the existing. Also due to the buildings positions there is a large increase in hard paving on the site, which is unacceptable in this sensitive location.

House 2 is also much closer to the northern boundary and the countryside beyond with a

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

reduction in open green space. The proposals do not respond to local building styles and therefore will negatively contribute to the natural beauty of the countryside and South Downs National Park. The proposals are therefore contrary to Local Plan Policies DP.3, DP.4, CE.5 and CE.23.

Tree Officer:

With regard to proposed tree retention and tree loss, there are no major issues arising from an Arboricultural point of view.

If the method statement is followed correctly, the retained trees onsite will have sufficient protection and will not be affected by the development subject to planning conditions.

Archaeology:

The landscape surrounding the application site is rich in archaeological remains, therefore a condition is recommended to secure a programme of archaeological work.

Hampshire County Council Ecology Team:

Submitted Ecology Report provides a broad assessment, but a bat survey will be required of the mature trees to be removed, prior to determination of this application.

Also a reptile's mitigation strategy is required from the ecologist.

Environment Agency:

The site is on a principle aquifer. Environment Agency consent is required for an discharge of sewage into controlled waters.

"Given the sensitivity of the site, the applicant should consider installing a package sewage treatment plant (rather than a septic tank) to ensure a higher quality of discharge".

English Nature

The proposals as presented have the potential to affect species protected under European or UK legislation. Natural England refers to their Standing Advice.

South Downs Joint Committee:

Objects and asks 'were the existing dwellings tied?'. Welcome highly sustainable dwellings, However the form and appearance of the proposed dwellings is unacceptable, they fail to respect local building styles.

There is a view of the site from the north-west, in which house 2, will be more visible than the current dwellings.

Even if hidden from view, this is not a justification for an inappropriate design.

Although a more traditional pitched roof would increase the visibility of the proposed dwellings this is preferable to the designs currently proposed.

Representations:

Itchen Valley Parish Council: Support:

Proposes an environmentally ambitious but achievable design for two bungalows. It ticks so many boxes of national, regional and local policies and guidelines.

The bungalows are small, two bedroom 120 square metre buildings which incorporate an office space for home working if necessary. The location is largely hidden from view from neighbouring properties, public roads and footpaths being well screened by existing trees, vegetation and the topography of the site.

The proposal also seeks to use locally sourced materials and labour.

Relevant Planning Policy:

South East Plan 2009:

SP.3, CC.4, CC6, H.1, T.7, NRM1, NRM2, NRM3, NRM4, NRN5, NRM11, BE.1, BE.4, BE.6, SH.8, C.2

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Winchester District Local Plan Review

DP.1, DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, DP.6, H.3, H.4, H.5, H.7, RT.4, T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, T.5, CE.10, CE.23

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS 3 Housing

PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

Other Policy Guidance

The Code for Sustainable Homes: Setting the standard in sustainability for new homes

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The principle of replacing these two small dwellings in the countryside is acceptable provided it accords with policy CE.23 of the Local Plan.

This policy states that replacement dwellings will be permitted provided (i) it does not significantly change the character of the existing dwelling, or result in increased visual intrusion, by increased size and/or unsympathetic design; (ii) it would not reduce the stock of small (1 or 2 bedroom) or more affordable dwellings in the countryside.

The dwellings to be replaced measure approximately 68 sq.m each, the replacement dwellings measure 120 sq.m externally. Each dwelling has two enclosed terraces and an enclosed bin store area which increases the developed area to 186 sq.m for each dwelling.

In order to retain smaller dwellings the policy requires dwellings under 120 sq.m not to be extended by more than 25%. The proposal to provide a dwelling with a floor area of 120 sq.m results in 76% increase. If the same calculation is undertaken including the enclosed terrace and bin store areas at 186 sq.m, this equates to a 173% increase. Contrary to the criteria (ii) of policy CE.23.

The proposed new dwellings measure 26.5m deep and are relatively narrow at 7m. This means the layout requires internal circulation space which increase the footprint of the dwelling and the visual intrusion into the surrounding countryside.

The proposed enclosed sun terraces do not address the surrounding landscape. Each dwelling has an enclosed sun terrace at either end and a bin store to the east, this together with the internal circulation space does not represent an efficient layout and increases the size of the dwellings and the visual intrusion in the countryside.

The applicant argues that the existing dwellings could be extended, without planning permission under current permitted development rights, to measure more than 140 sq.m in floor area. However, these extensions have not yet been completed and are not therefore part of the 120 sq.m consideration.

Supporting paragraph 4.78 of policy CE.23 explains that there is an over supply of large houses and that the Local Planning Authority will restrict increases in the size of existing dwellings of less than 120 sq.m, and goes on to say that this will normally be limited to no more than 25% of the existing. The reference to the word "existing" is pertinent, and does not include future permitted development rights. In any case, policy CE23 goes on to say that in considering planning applications to replace dwellings which have

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA

previously been extended, the Planning Authority will have regard to the effect of the proposals on the size and character of the original dwelling.

Policy H4 for the infill of dwellings in rural areas is also relevant for new dwellings in the countryside, however, the site does not lie in one of the settlements listed in policy H4, this policy does not therefore apply.

Impact on the character of the area

The site projects out into the open countryside. When it is glimpsed in distance views it is not seen as part of the caravan site, but as two small bungalows, on a site on their own. This proposal represents a significant change in the appearance and visual impact of the development on site. The Local Planning Authority considers that the increase in size represents a significant change from the character of the existing dwellings. The proposed siting, further north on site, results in increased visual intrusion in the countryside, which is compounded by the position of the second dwelling to the north of the existing.

The new dwelling encroaches further into the open undeveloped rural area to the north of the site. Whilst there was a building in this position on site in the past, it was demolished over 20 years ago and the proposed new dwelling here would have an incongruous suburban residential appearance in this open rural landscape.

The Local Planning Authority consider that the proposal causes harm to the open character of the National Park. These views are supported by the South Downs Joint Committee in line with the National Park policy C.2 in the South East Plan.

Live/work unit

The principle of a live/work unit is commendable, in reducing reliance on the private car. Whilst the new dwellings propose a home office area this does not achieve a live/work unit in the true sense. From the proposed floor plan it appears that the principle use of the new building will be as a family home, with only a 7 sq.m room annotated on the plans to be used as a "home office". This is similar to the space used in many family homes as a home office.

Sustainability

The applicant seeks to produce carbon neutral buildings which meet code 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

The applicant argues that the extra insulation proposed here reduces the useable internal floor area to 100m², further, that thermal mass and solar orientation contribute to a reduction in the energy budget of the dwelling.

The sustainable design of the new dwellings is welcome, however it does not justify the increased visual intrusion caused by the bulk, mass and positioning of these new dwellings.

Landscape/Trees

The increase in hard paving on site is unacceptable in this sensitive location and leads to an incongruous suburban appearance in the open undeveloped National Park.

The siting of house 2 closer to the northern site boundary also means that there is a reduction in open green space.

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA**

Recommendation

Application Refused for the following reason(s):

Reason(s)

1 The proposed development is contrary to policy C.2 of the South East Plan and Policies DP.3, CE.2, CE.3, CE.4, CE.5 and CE.23 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 in that:

(i) the replacement dwellings, due to their increased depth, length of frontage, bulk and the position of House 2 further north on the site would significantly change the character of the existing dwellings and result in increased visual intrusion within the National Park. As such it would harm the character and appearance of this rural environment.

(ii) the proposal fails to retain the stock of smaller more affordable dwellings in the countryside.

2 The proposal is contrary to Policy CE.10 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that the proposal would have a negative impact on bat and reptile conservation and no mitigation proposal has been put forward.

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

South East Plan 2009

SP.3, CC.4, CC6, H.1, T.7, NRM1, NRM2, NRM3, NRM4, NRN5, NRM11, BE.1, BE.4, BE.6, SH.8, C.2

Winchester District Local Plan Review

DP.1, DP.3, DP.4, DP.5, DP.6, H.3, H.4, H.5, H.7, RT.4, T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, T.5, CE.10, CE.23

Fiona Chaffers

From: john harris [mailto:john.harris@itchenvalley.com]

Sent: 08 April 2010 10:47

To: planning

Cc: Cllr Neil Baxter

Subject: Hobbs and Fisher Bungalow - Application 10/00102/FUL- for Planning Management East

For Case Officer.

Itchen Valley PC re-affirms that, should officers be inclined to decline this application, the case should be referred to Committee.

regards

John Harris

for and on behalf of Itchen Valley PC

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

13/05/2010