

PLANNING STATEMENT

10 MERDON AVENUE
CHANDLERS FORD
EASTLEIGH
SO53 1EJ

Prepared by

unsted design

16 Hazel Close,
Chandlers Ford,
EASTLEIGH,
SO53 5RF.

Tel: 023 8027 4720
Fax: 023 8027 4720
Web: www.UnstedDesign.co.uk
Email: mick@UnstedDesign.co.uk

June 2023

Introduction

This planning statement has been prepared to support the planning application at 10 Merdon Avenue, Chandlers Ford, SO53 1EJ

We will give a brief history of the site, a description of the surrounding area and a brief description of the design process.

Site History:

The original bungalow was built in 1927.

The carport/garage and loft space that this proposal seeks to add to was granted planning permission in 1992.

A planning application was submitted, reference number H/22/94350 in January of this year for additions to the garage/carport and refused in March.

Surrounding Area:

The property is situated close to the centre of Chandlers Ford. Merdon Avenue is a residential road with a mix of bungalows and substantial houses, the house opposite has had an extension added recently.

The Design Process:

The existing first floor of the bungalow only provides limited accommodation space. Our instructions from Mr and Mrs Laad were to create a master bedroom and to create space for a bedroom for one of their children and to provide home office space.

We first considered a two-storey rear extension but rejected this because the rear garden slopes down away from the property and we thought that it would have ended with a substantial extension which could have had an effect on the amenity of number 12. In addition, it would have been a relatively expensive addition and because it would have extended the existing relatively narrow first floor would have been a less functional space.

We then considered the design that was submitted for approval. We chose this option because it didn't require any new build out of the ground, we would be able to utilise the existing building as fully as possible, creating a wider space at the rear which made it more practical.

Planning Officers Comments.

It is considered that the proposed first floor side & rear extension would be a poor addition to the dwelling. While the first floor extension follows the current set back, its eaves and ridge height has been significantly raised so it reads as more of a two storey extension that would be out of keeping with the proportions of the chalet bungalow

We would obviously take issue with the description of the changes as a poor addition. It does not in our view read as a two-storey extension from the front. The roof over the side extension whilst higher than existing is still subservient to the main bungalow roof. The re arrangement of the space over the existing garage in our view has a minimal if any effect on the street scene. It is set a long way back from the front of the bungalow and at a lower

level. There is at best a narrow field of view from the street of the side extension, in our view it has no material effect on the street scene and with the changes made will not be noticeable.

The difference in levels between the subject property and Kendall Close mean that the left flank is completely screened from view from either private properties or any public view.

The rear view already contained a two-storey element which we have widened. We have used a part pitched/part flat roof design to give the impression of a pitched roof from ground level.

The design at the rear is only visible from the rear garden, a section of the garden of number 12 and from part of the meeting hall at the rear.

Planning Officers Comments.

The proposed extension has been designed to maximise internal space at the expense of integrating the extension into the existing chalet bungalow and as a result the first floor extension has ended up with an awkward roofline, which includes an unattractive flat roof section, bulky side gable and a mixture of opposing roof shapes and additional rear projection.

The planning officers' comment above is correct in that the design is intended to maximise floor space which is the point of the proposed additions. Based on the comments made, our understanding essentially is that no further additions would be acceptable. The kind of reductions being suggested would render the proposed work pointless.

We would take issue with the description of an awkward roof line. The intention has been to give the visual impression of a pitched roof when viewed from ground level. Also, there isn't an additional rear projection, the existing rear projection has simply been extended up to first floor level.

Amendments to previous design:

We have made some changes to the design in response to comments made by the planning officer. We have changed the roof design so that the eaves line drops and matches the existing eaves line. We have also reduced the overall roof height so that now it is only 450mm above the original roof line as well as creating a cropped hip detail which references the existing roof. We have superimposed a red dashed on the front and rear elevations to highlight the change.

Planning Consultant:

We have taken advice from a planning consultant who's advice was to go to appeal however we had missed the cut off time.

Conclusion:

We believe that we have submitted an acceptable scheme for the following reasons,

1. None of the proposed works adversely affect the amenity of any of the neighbours.
2. To the front of the property, the proposed changes to the side extension have a very minor effect on the street scene.
3. There is no view of the left flank of the property so if one accepts the description of a 'bulky side gable' it is irrelevant.
4. The view at the back is only visible from the rear garden.

We consider that all the reasons for refusal are subjective and are not relevant to either the street scene or neighbours' amenity and this revised application should be granted permission bearing in mind that changes have been made following comments from the previous application.