

CFH – Chandlers Ford and Hiltingbury Local Area Committee Wednesday 19 June 2019.

Application Number: H/19/85372
Case Officer: Rosie Rivers
Received Date: Friday 5 April 2019
Site Address: 85 HOCOMBE ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5QB
Applicant: Bright
Proposal: Two storey side and front extensions, single storey side extension, raised patio at Rear, front & rear dormers and alterations to fenestration

Recommendation: REFUSE

CONDITIONS AND REASONS

1. The proposed development due to its scale, form and design would create a dominant and incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal would be out of keeping with the street scene and detrimental to the Arcadian character and visual amenity of the surrounding area. As such the proposed development is contrary to Saved Policies 59.BE and 181.LB of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Note to Applicant: The application was refused following the assessment of the following plans: 544.PL.SITE, 544.PL.BLOCK, 544.PL.STREET, 544.PL.ENT, 544PL.001, 544.PL.201, 544.PL.202, 544.PL.204, 544.PL.206, 544.PL.207, 544.PL.208, 544.PL.212, 544.SU.001, 544.SU.002, 544.SU.004, 544.SU.005, 544.SU.006, 544.SU.007 and 544.SU.008. . In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019), Eastleigh Borough Council takes a positive approach to the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome and to ensure all proposals are dealt with in a timely manner.

Report:

This application has been referred to Committee at the request of Councillor Groves, Councillor Duguid and Councillor Broadhurst.

Description of Application

1. The application proposes a two storey extension to the side of the property, a two storey infill extension to the front of the property, front and rear dormers and alterations to the fenestration and external materials.

Site Characteristics

2. The site consists of a two storey detached dwelling located on the south of Hocombe Road. The property has parking to the front of the site and flat roof single storey elements at either side of the property. There are trees to the front and rear of the site. The trees to the rear of the property are protected by TPOs.
3. The surrounding area generally consists of detached dwellings set in large plots.

Relevant Planning History

H/17/81785 - Two and a half storey side extension, two storey front extension, raised patio at rear and roof and elevational alterations – refused 14/03/2018
Appeal dismissed 23/07/2018

T/17/80689 – Fell 1no. Sweet Chestnut – Refuse tree consent 27/11/2017

T/09/65620 - Lopping of 1No. Ash to approximately 8 metres and 1No. Western Red Cedar to approximately 8 metres. Consent for tree works 04/09/2009

T/04/52351 - Crown lift 1no. Oak by 4m and reduce branches by 2m, all to suitable growth points – Consent for tree works 05/11/2004

Z/07268/002/00 – First floor side extension – Permit 22/04/1983

Further applications for works to trees

Representations Received

11 Letters of support on the following grounds:

- In keeping with the character of the area
- No impact on neighbouring property
- Existing property needs to be updated

15 letters of objection on the following grounds:

- Impact on street scene
- Not in keeping with the spacious character and low density of the area/ character of the area
- Excessive in scale and bulk, bear no relation to the scale of the existing building – combination of length, height and position
- Limited changes to proposal
- Proposed is too bulky and dominant for site
- Contravenes the special policy area policy
- Impact on neighbour amenity
 - o Overbearing
 - o Visually intrusive
 - o Loss of light

- Impact on patio and garden of no.83
- Overlooking, loss of privacy
- Proposed planting will cause damage to existing properties
- Set a precedent for other development within the area

Consultation Responses

Council's tree officer: No objection, subject to a condition. Further comments regarding the planting proposed on the boundary.

Chandlers Ford Parish Council: None received

Policy Context: Designation Applicable to Site

- Within Built-up Area Boundary
- Within Established Residential Area
- Hiltingbury and Hocombe Park Special Policy Area

Legislative provisions, development plan saved policies, emerging local plan policies, SPD's and National planning policy

Legislative provisions:

4. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require a local planning authority determining an application to do so in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan

5. At the current time the Development Plan for the Borough comprises the Saved Policies within the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (October 2013). The policies contained within the latter are not considered to be applicable to the particular development proposed as part of this application.

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011

6. The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 (the adopted Local Plan) was adopted in May 2006. In November 2008, the Council submitted a list of proposed Saved Policies to the Secretary of State with a request that they be saved until they could be replaced by a new Local Development Framework. The following policies were saved and are considered to be of relevance to the development proposals: Saved policy 59.BE (promoting good design), 181.LB (Hiltingbury Special Policy Area), 104.T (Parking).

Emerging Local Plan Policies

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014:

7. The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 was submitted for examination in July 2014 but the Inspector concluded that insufficient housing was being provided for in the Plan and that it was unsound. While this has not been withdrawn and remains a material consideration, it can therefore be considered to have extremely limited weight in the determination of this application.

The Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036:

8. Following *The Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029* being found unsound, the Council has prepared *the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036*. The Plan has been subject to public consultation (Regulation 19), the period for which ran from 25 June until 8 August 2018, and has subsequently been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination (on 31 October 2018) with hearings scheduled to take place in the autumn (between September and November).
9. The other relevant policies of both the 2011-2029 and 2016-2036 plans essentially echo the requirements of those of the adopted local plan as listed above and are not therefore considered to effect the recommendation put forward.

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places (November 2011)
- Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards (January 2009)

National Planning Policy

10. At a national level, The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF' or the 'Framework') is a material consideration of significant weight in the determination of planning applications. The National Planning Practice Guidance provides additional guidance in support of the Framework and should be afforded weight in the consideration of planning applications.

Assessment of Proposal

Principle

11. The site is located within the urban edge where the principle of development is considered to be acceptable subject to the design and impact of the proposal in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies and supplementary planning documents.
12. Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians,

make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

13. Policy 181.LB states the redevelopment of plots will not be permitted unless all the following criteria are met:

- I. The size of any proposed plot is not significantly smaller than those in the immediate vicinity of the site;
- II. the proposal does not involve the loss or prejudice the retention of existing healthy mature trees on the site;
- III. the design, siting, scale and proposed development is compatible with the Arcadian character of the locality and does not involve back land or tandem development; and
- IV. the proposal is accompanied by a detailed planting scheme designed to assimilate the development into its surroundings.

Planning history

14. The application follows the previously refused application H/17/81785. This application was for two storey extensions, roof alterations and dormers and alterations to the fenestration. The application was refused due to the scale, form and design of the proposed extensions. The proposal was considered to result in a dominant and incongruous feature with the existing dwelling and would be out of keeping with the street scene and character of the surrounding area.

15. The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal. The Inspector considered that the proposal was substantial in scale due to its aggregate height, width and depth and would appear overly bulky and dominant in the street scene. The proposal was also not considered to sit comfortably with the host dwelling itself. The proposed front gable was considered to be disproportionately large. The Inspector concluded that the proposal is not acceptable in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings. The Inspector also considered that the impact on the neighbouring properties (no.83) garden and patio and study/bedroom windows would merit close examination if a further application were to be submitted.

16. The following changes have been made to the current application:

- The roof pitch has been altered to a 30 degree pitch, which results in the roof being 200mm lower than the refused application. The second floor accommodation has been removed from the proposal
- The width of the two storey extension has been reduced at first floor by 300mm
- Alterations have been made to the fenestration and garage door
- Alterations have been made to the materials
- Additional planting is proposed on the boundaries and additional planting has been carried out on the site

Layout, design and impact on the character of the area

17. The application site lies within a low density residential area. The dwellings on Hocombe Road are mixed in terms of their form and design. 85 Hocombe Road is a two storey dwelling with flat roof single storey elements either side of the property. The neighbouring property no.83 is a bungalow, no.87 is a part two storey part single storey dwelling.
18. There is a good size gap between the application dwelling and no.87 to the east with heavy screening when viewing the properties from the road. The siting of no.85 and 83 is much tighter with less planting. It is considered that this close positioning does not run counter to the low density and spacious character of the areas because of the single storey elements of both properties close to the mutual boundary.
19. The proposed changes to the two storey extension have been carefully considered, however, the proposed modest changes have not overcome the concerns raised by the Planning Inspector. It is considered that the proposal would still be substantial in scale in terms of its aggregate height, width and depth and would appear as overly bulky and dominant in relation to the existing dwelling.
20. The Planning Inspector considered that the spacing provided between the application site and no.83 was an important part of the street scene and the single storey additions at either side of these properties maintained the spacious character of the area. It is noted that the pitch of the roof has been altered and the width of the extension has been reduced by 300mm, however, these are not considered to be significant enough to address the Planning Inspectors concerns regarding the relationship with the neighbouring property and the impact on the street scene. It is therefore maintained that the proposal would be overly dominant and incongruous within the street scene especially due to the its relationship with the nearby flat roofed garage and low profile of the bungalow at no.83.
21. Whilst it is accepted that there are two storey properties along Hocombe Road it is maintained that the proposed extension would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area especially when viewed in conjunction with the two neighbouring properties which are predominately single storey. This relationship is accentuated due to the close proximity of the extension to no.83. Whilst the design of the extension has been reduced, albeit only a small amount, the reasons set out in the appeal decision have not been overcome. The proposal is therefore considered to have a detrimental impact on the street scene and character of the surrounding area in conflict with saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan. It is considered that the proposed development is not in keeping with the character of the locality in conflict with Policy 181.LB of the Local Plan.
22. Planting has been proposed on the boundary with the neighbouring property no.83 to help screen the proposed development. The details regarding the

planting have been noted, however, concerns are raised that the ability for the landscaping to successfully grow is somewhat limited, and therefore successful screening cannot be assured. Notwithstanding this it is considered that the proposed planting to screen the proposal would not address the concerns raised above.

Impact on residential amenity

23. The proposed two storey extension would be positioned along the boundary with the neighbouring property no.83 Hocombe Road. This neighbouring property is a bungalow.
24. The proposed two storey extension would maintain a separation distance of 2.6m to the boundary with this neighbouring property and 3.5m (at first floor level) to the side of the garage/annexe room. The rear of the two storey extension would not extend beyond the rear of the neighbouring properties rear wall. It is considered that due to the separation distance between the proposed extension and the neighbouring property and the rear wall of the extension not extending beyond the neighbouring properties rear wall the proposal would not cause material harm in terms of over dominance.
25. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would be visible from the neighbouring properties garden area, however, it is noted that the neighbouring property has a reasonable sized amenity area and the proposed extension is not considered to be over dominant to the main private amenity space.
26. Due to the orientation of the sun the proposed extension is not considered to result in a material loss of light to the neighbouring property. Concerns have been raised by the neighbouring property that the proposal would impact on the front garden area and west facing window. It is noted that the front garden area is used for parking and is not a main amenity space, it is considered that due to the orientation of the sun, the proposal would not result in a material loss of light or overshadowing such that would warrant a reason for refusal on the current application.
27. Concerns have been raised by the neighbouring property regarding overlooking from the front and rear facing windows and obscure glazed windows if they could be opened. These windows would face towards the front and rear of the application. There are currently first floor facing windows in the front and rear of the property which would provide similar views towards the neighbouring property and therefore the proposal is not considered to cause material harm in terms of overlooking from the proposed front and rear facing windows. It should also be noted that this is a normal relationship for properties within the urban area. The point regarding the obscure glazed windows could be address by a suitable planning condition if permission were to be granted.
28. The planning Inspector considered in his report

29. *‘Nonetheless, the long section of a new roof high enough to accommodate second floor accommodation and directly facing the western flank of No. 83 would be dominant in the outlook from the patio area and the areas of the garden nearest to it. In the event that further proposals come forward following the dismissal of this appeal, both this and the effect on the outlook from a study / bedroom in the western elevation of No. 83 would merit close examination.’*
30. The application has been amended to remove the second floor accommodation from the proposal and alter the roof pitch of the proposed extension. The comments regarding the impact from the outlook from the patio area and garden closes to the extension and study/bedroom window have been further considered and whilst concerns are maintained above regarding the size and scale of the proposed extension it is considered that due to the positioned of the proposed extension it would not result in material harm in terms of loss of outlook to the neighbouring property to warrant a reason for refusal.

Impact on trees

31. No arboricultural information has been submitted with the application. There are significant trees to the front and rear of the site. There are also TPO trees on the site.
32. Following consultation with the Council’s Tree Officer no objection is raised to the application if care is given to the existing trees during construction. A condition has been recommended for a tree protection plan if permission were to be granted.

Conclusion

33. The proposal is therefore considered to result in a proposal that is overly dominant and would be an incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal would be out of keeping with the street scene and detrimental to the Arcadian character and visual amenity of the surrounding area in conflict with Policy 59.BE and 181.LB of the Local Plan. It is considered that the proposed changes to the extensions have not overcome the previous reasons for refusal or the dismissed appeal.