

TREVOR J. BELL

ARCHITECTURAL TECHNICIAN

Architectural Services.

3 Church Cottages, Blackmoor, Liss, Hants. GU33 6BW.

Our ref: T768

Your ref:

Date: 20th April 2022

SDNPA Planning
c/o Penns Place
Petersfield
GU31 4EX

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Rear extension to Old Brewers, Brewers Lane, Monkwood, W. Tisted SO24 0HQ.

I have submitted our Householder application on line via the Planning Portal (ref: PP-11199063) for the above proposal. I have paid the relevant fee of £206.00 electronically. I trust you have all the information necessary to determine the application.

The applicants are seeking to extend the rear of the existing 3 storey house (+ basement) by forming a small single storey extension to extend the Kitchen to form a Family/Breakfast space. The current Kitchen is a little cramped and has a limited view of the rear garden. The extension will allow a much improved "living" space within the Kitchen area and allow the owners to create an improved casual dining and relaxation space whilst still sharing the use of the Kitchen area. The current spaces within the house each side of the Kitchen are all well used and prevent the enlargement of the Kitchen area sufficiently within the current footprint.

We have shown a modest addition which offers the space required without adding too much volume to the property. The design will allow a triple aspect room to benefit fully from the surrounding garden areas and the views across the fields to the rear (north). We have shown a raised flat roof to give the roof some feature but avoid disturbing the window and views from the rooms above. External materials to match the existing house would be used, i.e. matching bricks and tiles.

We believe in general this proposal would meet the majority of your current criteria for extending properties within the countryside (SD31). The one sensitive aspect will be the increase in overall habitable floorspace. Old Brewers has been extended since 2002 under the limitations imposed by EHDC's H16 Policy. Alterations were made to extend the ground floor marginally but primarily the additions were at first and second floor levels. I have applied some calculations to the changes that were made and I disagree with the percentage increase arrived at by EHDC Planning at the time. By my calculations I believe the increase in habitable space over and above the original size in April 1974 (EHDC's base date) is 37%. 296.37sqm rising to 407.43sqm. That was found to be acceptable at the time and was subsequently formerly approved in 2005 I believe. That consent has been implemented. That would mean there could possibly have been scope to extend the house further under EHDC's H16 ruling but that Policy has now been overridden by your own new Local Plan.

Your Authority's preferred limit of a 30% approx increase in habitable floorspace since 2002 will have been marginally exceeded by the work already carried out. The main aim of this limitation within that Policy we believe is to retain existing small and medium size houses, thereby to ensure there remains a variation in size of rural properties available to prospective owners and protect the variation within current housing stock. However we would argue that with the alterations already allowed to this property it has already moved into a large house format and has ventured beyond

the size of property the Policy is seeking to protect. It also benefits from large existing outbuildings and several acres of land to accompany it which further push the property away from the small/medium designation.

Whilst we recognise there is a need to protect rural housing in the National Park and EHDC areas from overdevelopment we believe this property has already exceeded the need to be further restricted. The proposal we are putting forward is a modest extension and will only add approximately 24sqm of additional habitable space to the house. This would only add a further 8% of extra space over and above the original size (SDNP base). This small increase will not affect the definition of the house and not move it into a different size/price bracket.

The extension will be totally hidden from the highway and neighbouring dwellings so will have no impact on those aspects of the surroundings. To the rear there are open fields which are within the ownership of the applicants so again the impact on neighbouring owners is avoided. The visual impact on the countryside is negligible and will not therefore detract from the character or appearance of the National Park. We therefore feel the proposals follow the essence of your policy SD5.

If you require further details or information to assist your decision then please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

Trevor J Bell