

# KNIGHT

## Consulting

ARCHITECTURE – SURVEYING - PLANNING

### Statement of Case for Appeal

**Site:** 34 Stockholm Drive, Hedge End, Southampton, SO30 0LJ

**Application Number:** H/25/100649

**Proposal:** Single storey front extension with alterations to front porch, altering from flat roof to pitch roof.

---

Following the refusal of the householder application at 34 Stockholm Drive, we are looking to appeal against the decision based upon the judgement made by the Planning Officer regarding the proposal and in doing so - going against the National Planning Policy Framework by deciding not to work with us to achieve a positive outcome.

As per the decision notice, the reason for refusal is as follows:

1. The proposed development, due to its siting, design, massing and scale, would create an unattractive and incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of neighbouring properties and detrimental to the character and pattern of development within the locality. As such the proposed development is contrary to the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan [2016-2036].
- 

The application site relates to a residential property within an established suburban area characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings. Whilst the original form of development along Stockholm Drive exhibits a degree of uniformity, several dwellings have deviated from over time through the implementation of domestic extensions and alterations.



The host dwelling itself has been subject to a side extension, which has altered its original appearance and reduced the degree to which it reflects the initial design of the wider group. Also, the site is adjacent to No. 36 Stockholm Drive which starts a row of single-storey bungalows which form a distinct shift in the scale, massing and built form. The appeal property therefore sits at a transitional point within the street scene,



The proposed development is for a 1.2metre projecting single storey bay window with a pitched roof oversailing across the existing garage. The extension is limited in depth and width and is believed to remain subordinate to the host dwelling. The introduction of a pitched roof represents a common domestic design solution and is reflective of built form seen on the opposite side of the road.

The key issue in the determination of the application relates to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. It is acknowledged that the surrounding properties were originally constructed to a broadly consistent design. However, it is evident from a site appraisal that this uniformity has been diluted through incremental changes to individual dwellings.

In particular, Nos. 9 and 14 Stockholm Drive have introduced front-facing alterations, including pitched roofs and porch structures, which diverge from the original design approach. These properties are prominently located at the junction from the main road and are therefore highly visible within the public realm. As such, they may make a notable contribution to the established character of the area.

In this context, the presence of varied porch designs and roof forms is an established characteristic of the street scene. The proposed development would not introduce a novel or isolated feature but rather reflect an existing pattern of alteration. The proposed pitched roof is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design and would integrate satisfactorily with the host dwelling. It would not appear visually dominant or result in a discordant addition when viewed within context of neighbouring properties.



The position of the application site is a material consideration in the assessment of the proposal. The immediate adjacency to No.36 Stockholm Drive, and the transition to bungalow development beyond, results in a discernible change in built form at this point in the locality. As such, the appeal property does not sit within a continuous run of identical dwellings, but rather at a point where variation in scale and design is already evident. The proposal would therefore be read within this context of transition and would not be believed to appear out of place.

It is also relevant to note that no pre-determination engagement was undertaken by the Local Planning Authority. Despite multiple attempts to seek feedback, no opportunity was provided to address or amend the scheme prior to the issuing of the decision. This approach by Eastleigh is not consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, which places emphasis on positive and proactive decision-making and the importance of working collaboratively with applicants to secure acceptable development.

Therefore, having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area. The street scene is not uniform and exhibits several examples where front elevations have been altered, including the introduction of pitched roof porches. The proposal is modest in scale, appropriately designed, and would sit comfortably within this established context. Furthermore, the site occupies a transitional position within the streetscape, where a degree of variation is both evident and appropriate.

The reason for refusal is therefore not substantiated when assessed against the site context and existing pattern of development. The proposal is considered to accord with the objectives of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan [2016-2036] and the National Planning Policy Framework.



It is therefore respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed, and the planning decision be overturned.

Kind Regards,  
Knight Consulting