

## 13 SATCHELL LANE - PLANNING STATEMENT

This statement accompanies the revised planning application made to the Eastleigh Borough Council (LPA) on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Simpson (Client/applicant). The purpose of this statement is to highlight the changes made to overcome the reasons for refusal and the appeal inspectorates' comments.

The original submission by Tony Holt Design following a pre application with the LPA resulted in a refusal on the following grounds.

1) The resulting dwelling, by virtue of its form, height, scale, materials and appearance would result in an incongruous and unsettling feature within the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenity and prevailing character of this section of Satchell Lane, as well as the setting and approach into the Hamble Conservation Area. As such, the application is considered to be contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 and the Councils 'Quality Places', 'Hamble-le-Rice Conservation Area Appraisals' Supplementary Planning Documents.

2) The resulting dwelling, by virtue of its form., height, scale, depth, materials and appearance would result in a visually dominating structure in close proximity to neighbouring gardens, to the detriment of the amenity, outlook and enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers, as such, the application is considered to be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 and the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document.

3) Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate whether the proposed development would result in harm to protected species which are known to be present in the locality. As such, the application is considered to be contrary to Policy Dm12 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036.

The new proposals are for a radical redesign of the proposals. The proposals can be split into 4 key elements.

- A. Single storey flat roof rear extension & partial Two storey rear extension
- ~~B. Alterations to the roof and loft conversion.~~
- C. Single storey side extension.
- D. External alterations to the materials/windows and the impact on the character of the area

Each point is addressed below.

### Eastleigh Borough Council Comments from Case Officer Report

#### PLANNING INSPECTORATE DECISION REPORT

A: Single storey flat roof rear extension.

The LPA concluded that this extension would be unacceptable and create a visually intrusive structure.

*In terms of loss of outlook, whilst the first floor rear projection has been set back to a degree, the 3.0 metre height of the ground floor projection's parapet and bulk of the remaining rear additions*

*proposed, together with the use of light coloured render and copper coloured cladding will make the dwelling far more visible when viewed from the rear elevations of both immediate neighbours, as well as introduce a visually dominating and intrusive structure in very close proximity to the site boundaries, to the detriment of the enjoyment of neighbouring rear gardens. This is considered to be unacceptable and contrary to Policy DM1 and the 'Quality Places' SPD.*

The appeal inspectorate disagreed with this assessment in their report.

*The existing property has a number of single-storey extensions to the rear and the overall depth of the proposal would more or less align with the existing conservatory. The significant part of the rear element would be single-storey and due to the boundary fencing, landscaping and modest height, it would not be overly imposing. The copper cladding would primarily be to the side elevation sitting adjacent to the side elevation of No.15, which is in part rendered. Therefore, whilst the development would be visible from the neighbours' gardens, I do not find the relationship or materials would result in the development being overbearing.*

The new proposals would extend to the rear the same as the previous extension although the new pitched roof would have a lower eaves when compared to the previous parapet heights and would therefore reduce the impact on the neighbours. The new pitched roof slopes away from the boundary to reduce any impact on their outlook. No windows are proposed in the side elevations.

~~B: Alterations to the roof and loft conversion.~~

~~The new roof design takes on board several key points. It reverts to the existing pitched roof which is original. The applicant would be able to create a hip to gable roof on both side elevations under permitted development and convert the existing roof space into loft accommodation. This has primarily informed the roof design and shape.~~

C: Single storey side extension

The site has some challenges with the splaying boundaries and its tight abutment to the shared boundary with No.11. We therefore proposed creating a new single storey side extension which could largely be constructed under permitted development for a single storey side extension to a maximum of half the width of the original house. This side extension under PD could be built much closer to the shared boundary with No.15 to create space for the entrance hall but the applicant has a preference to achieve some additional height in the entrance hall which would give them the feeling of space internally whilst maintaining space to the boundary. This additional height would result in the extension not fully complying with the rules of PD however the applicant is hopeful that the LPA see a compromise for all in allowing the minor increase in height through planning to avoid the extra width.

D: External alterations to the materials/windows and the impact on the character of the area

The original submission and appeal design was for a very contemporary flat roof art deco inspired proposal. The conservation officer expressed concern over the modern appearance and its impact on the CA and views from the river. This view was not shared by the appeal inspectorate.

*This stretch of Satchell Lane does link the various parts of the HCA, nevertheless, the distinct areas of the HCA are separated from the appeal site by intervening properties and/or a change in levels.*

*Therefore, whilst the proposal will result in an individual and prominent building within its street scene, I am not persuaded that the change would affect the significance of the HCA as a whole and would be harmful to its setting.*

The new proposals although are still modern when compared to the immediate neighbours it's clear that more modern pitched roof dwellings are present along this stretch of Satchell Lane (No.3 & No.9) both of far more contemporary appearance than the current proposals. Both these properties comprise of almost entirely glazed front facades. The proposals for this application seek to remove the bay window and replace it with floor to ceiling glass ~~with a vaulted living room on the first floor.~~ The raised position of the dwelling relative to the road will provide the occupants with a suitable degree of privacy and the feeling that they overlook the public domain not the other way around. The windows will be fitted with suitable blinds that will also offer the occupants the ability to maintain their privacy when required.

*there are other properties within the row (Nos.3 and 9) which have been reconfigured to have a more contemporary appearance and have successfully assimilated within the street scene. However, they retain a pitched roof form and are very different in design.*

The case officer through the pre app has expressed that it would be a shame for the loss of the mock Tudor boards but as highlighted the applicant will be removing these regardless and rendering the property without the need for planning and therefore their retention carries little weight.

The applicant has already obtained a Bat survey which shows no evidence of bats present.

The applicant is eager to progress with the development asap and therefore the LPA swift attention would be greatly appreciated.