

Our Ref: PC/201045/P5

22 September 2022

East Hampshire District Council
Penns Place
Petersfield
Hampshire
GU31 4EX



Dear Sirs,

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Proposal: Erection of garage following demolition of store and bin store

At: Russell House, Bentworth, Alton, GU34 5RB

PP-11552023

Fowler Architecture & Planning Ltd have been instructed by Dr & Mrs R Fawcett ('the Applicants') to submit an application for Full Planning Permission to East Hampshire District Council in respect of the above proposed development at Russell House, Bentworth.

The application has been submitted via the Planning Portal and comprises the following:

- Completed application form and ownership certificates;
- Completed Validation Checklist;
- Completed Biodiversity Checklist;
- Completed CIL form1;
- Drawing No. 201045-01: Location Plan at 1:1250 (A4);
- Drawing No. OOrussellhTOPO.A: Topographic Site Survey at 1:200 (A0)
- Drawing No. 201045-18: Proposed Garage Plans & Elevations at 1:100 (A3);
- Drawing No. 201045-23: Proposed Site & Block Plan at 1:200 / 500 (A1);
- Extended PEA / Phase 2 Bat Survey – Phillips Ecology;
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment – SJ Stephens Associates;
- Planning, Design (including Heritage) & Access Statement – Fowlers (see below).

The requisite planning fee of £206 has been paid via the Planning Portal.

Planning, Design (inc. Heritage) & Access Statement

Introduction, Context and Recent Planning History

This application follows several recent planning applications for the site, in particular the recent approval for a replacement dwelling on the site, under application ref. no. 24622/021 (10/09/2021), and subsequent minor amendments to that approved scheme (24622/022, approved 21/07/2022).

However, a recent application which sought for alterations to the design of the dwelling as well as the erection of an associated garage, considered under application ref. no. 24622/023, was refused by the LPA on 22/07/2022. The Decision Notice and associated Officer's Report makes clear that the reason for refusal rested on the proposed amended design of the dwelling rather than the garage itself – this is considered in more detail below.

On this basis, this application proposal seeks planning permission solely for the erection of a garage, following the demolition of the existing store and bin-store on the footprint of the proposed garage.

Planning History

In addition to the above recent planning history, planning application 24622/019 (made by a previous owner of the site) which sought permission for: *"Single storey side extension and replacement timber frame garage (as amended by plans received 29 June 2020)"* was approved on 14/07/2020. That planning permission is relevant in terms of the consideration and approval of the garage.

Application Proposal

As referenced above, the recently submitted Section 73 application seeks approval for the following design amendments:

- demolition of existing store and bin-store;
- erection of 2-bay cartshed with store, 9.7m by 6.2m ext., 4.4m to ridge; timber boarding on brick plinth with clay tile roof.

This is the proposed design scheme which formed an amendment during the course of the previous application (as considered below). It is envisaged that, should this application be granted permission, it would be implemented alongside the recent approval for the replacement dwelling.

Planning Policies

The relevant planning policies, as set out in the Officer's Report to the previous scheme(s), are as follows:

East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014)

- CP1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development

- CP30 – Historic Environment
- CP29 – Design
- CP21 – Biodiversity
- CP24 – Sustainable construction

East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (2006)

- HE8 – Development affecting the setting of a conservation area
- HE12 – Development affecting the setting of a Listed Building

Planning Statement

The previous application which included a garage – as well as alterations to the dwelling – was refused for the following stated single reason:

“Due to the disjointed appearance of the single storey element of the dwelling through the use of an unattractive flat roof and inappropriate fenestration detailing the proposal would harm the settling of the nearby listed buildings and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bentworth Conservation Area. The development is therefore contrary to Policies CP29 and CP30 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy and Policy HE8 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and Government advice contained within Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

Clearly, there is no reference within this reason for refusal as to the proposed garage being unacceptable. This reflects the comments in the Case Officer’s Report, which states that:

“In this instance the existing garage is to the front of the dwelling and the proposed garage would be no further forward than the existing. There are other examples of garages to the front of dwellings, and built form right up to the highway within the area. Consequently, the siting of garage would not be out of keeping with the existing site and the surrounding built form. The amended plans reduced the height of the garage from 5 metres to 4.4 metres and reduced its footprint. The garage would be set back from the highway the same distance as the existing garage and would have similar height to the carport at the adjoining site, Hill House. There is a hedge on the front boundary and whilst the hedge does not need to be relied upon to make the garage acceptable it would help to soften the appearance of the garage. Furthermore, the garage would have a cat slide roof which would be half hipped to keep its bulk to a minimum.

...and goes on to state that:

“The garage would be a minimum of 1 metre from the shared boundary with Hill House with the lowest part of its roof orientated towards the boundary and its roof pitched away from the boundary, and it would be approximately 15 metres from Hill House itself. The potential loss of the screening provided by the mature high hedge which forms the boundary between the application site and Hill House has been raised as an issue through representations. However, for the reasons discussed above, its retention is not necessary for screening purposes.”

Based on the amended plans submitted during the course of determination of the application, it was confirmed that: *“Following the submission of amended plans for the garage the Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the amended garage design.”*

In terms of the planning issues raised by this revised application proposal, these largely reflect the issues with the previously approved scheme, and are considered below:

Technical issues

This application is accompanied by both the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Extended PEA and Phase 2 Bat Survey which, through the consideration of application ref. no. 24622/022, have been previously confirmed by the LPA as being acceptable to address these technical issues.

Conclusions and Close

Based on the above, the proposed garage is considered to be entirely acceptable in the context of the relevant Local Plan policies and previous recent conclusions from the LPA regarding the acceptability of the revised form of garage.

I trust that the enclosed information is sufficient for this application to be registered at the earliest opportunity. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any additional information.

Yours faithfully,

P. Crozier

Peter Crozier BA(Hons) DipUP MRTPI

FOWLER ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING

Encs

cc: Clients