

(HEWEB, Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Area Committee,
05/02/2024)

Application Number: H/23/95222
Case Officer: Alexandra Stone
Received Date: 15/05/2023
Site Address: 64 Goodlands Vale, Hedge End, SO30 4SN
Applicant: Tony Mathew
Proposal: Single storey front, rear and side extension. Two storey side extension. Demolition of garage

Recommendation: REFUSE for the following reason:

REASON:

The proposed development due to its siting, design, massing and scale would create an unattractive and incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of the house/ neighbouring properties and detrimental to the character and pattern of development within the locality. As such the proposed development is contrary to policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review [2016-2036] and Quality Places SPD.

Note to Applicant: In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021), 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. In this instance the application has been refused as it is contrary to the relevant policies of the Local Plan and the planning harm was unable to be resolved in a timely manner

1. Report:

2. This application has been referred to Committee because an EBC Councillor lives in close proximity.

3. Site Characteristics and Character of the Locality

4. The property is a three-bedroom detached house, which fronts onto Goodlands Vale. The dwelling has a cross gable roof and has a detached garage to the East side elevation. There is a footpath running along the western side of the property meaning that the front, side and rear of the dwelling is visible from the public realm.

5. The property is surrounded by other two storey dwellings of similar designs and materials. There is some variation within the street with small dormer windows above the garages.

6. Description of Application

7. The application is to demolish the existing garage/ utility room to create a one and a half storey, pitch roof, side extension with pitch roof dormer windows to the front and rear. The extension measures approximately 4.7m by 6.2m and would provide an extra bedroom with separate staircase and enlarge the existing kitchen.
8. The proposal includes a single storey, pitch roof, front porch extension with a gable porch. The front extension measures approximately 1.4m by 4.6m and replaces a small pitch roof canopy over the front door.
9. Also proposed is a wraparound single storey side and rear extension, creating a study at the side and further extending the kitchen to then rear. The extension has a pitched roof and has a maximin width of 16.5m (along the rear) and a maximum depth of 8.6m (at the side).
10. The proposed materials will match that of the existing dwelling.

11. Relevant Planning History

12. Z/35397/001/00 – Permit – 27/07/1998

Construction of single storey rear extension

13. Representations Received

14. 65 Goodlands Vale (Summarised):

The dormer would encroach on their privacy as it overlooks garden and conservatory.

The garage wall serves boundary treatment and holds roof of their side extension and solar panels.

Plans incorrect in regard to placement of existing garage.

15. Consultation Responses

16. **Hedge End Town Council:** Objection due to overdevelopment

17. **Southern Water:** No objection

18. Policy Context and Designations Applicable to Site

- Within Built-up Area Boundary
- Within Established Residential Area

19. Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

20. Development Management policies:

21. The most relevant policies are:

22. Strategic policies

- S1 (Delivering sustainable development);
- S2 (Approach to new development);

23. Development Management policies:

- DM1 (General criteria for new development);
- DM11 (Nature conservation);
- DM14 (Parking).

24. Supplementary Planning Documents

- Quality Places (November 2011);
- Residential Parking Standards (January 2009);

25. National Planning Policy Framework

26. At 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 Policy Framework (the 'NPPF' or the 'Framework') states that (as required by statute) applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and sets out a general presumption in favour of sustainable development unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

27. National Planning Practice Guidance

28. Where material, the Planning Practice Guidance which supports the provisions and policies of the NPPF should be afforded weight in the consideration and determination of planning applications.

29. Assessment of Proposal: Development Plan and / or Legislative Background

30. 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 comprises the Saved Policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013 (which is not applicable in this case). The NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance constitute material considerations of significant weight.

31. Principle:

32. The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the design details complying with the relevant planning policies.

33. Design and Appearance:

34. As part of Policy DM1, development is required to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality, and be well integrated (in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting), both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views. Where adjoining development is poor in urban design terms, new development should contribute to improving the character of the area.
35. The dwellings within Goodlands Vale are of a similar design with side garages set back from the main dwelling and simple pitched roof canopies over their front doors and sometimes over their front bay windows. Where there are a few examples of garage conversions, the dormer windows are small so sit unobtrusively within their roof slopes.
36. In comparison, the proposal would have a number of different roof formations, creating an unattractive shape to the dwelling, which would be seen from both the road and adjoining public footpath.
37. The front porch extension would not be in keeping with the wider street scene as it is a mix of gable and pitch roof. It also creates a much larger footprint, compared to the existing canopy, which would appear odd in comparison to other dwellings in the close. The porch's roof line also projects slightly in front of the existing gable so looks uncomfortable next to this feature. The design of the single storey front porch extension is not suited to the dwelling in terms of its form and appearance.
38. The proposed one and a half storey side extension has overly large dormer windows in comparison to that of the garage's roof slope and would be out of keeping and jar with the features of the host property. The dormer windows would also be much larger than those on the neighboring garages. The garage itself is no longer set back from the front of the dwelling, which would also make it more prominent in relation to other garages within the street scene.
39. Turning to the wrap around side and rear extension, this has been designed to fit the triangular space at the side of the dwelling of the plot, and as such has a mixture of different roof forms and projections, which makes it appear incongruous and unattractive when compared against the simple lines of the main dwelling. It would also be out of place within the street scene due to the roofline and being highly noticeable from the public footpath.
40. A further concern is the size of the proposed extensions, which would almost double the footprint of the main dwelling and are excessive in relation to the dwelling.

41. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would result in a number of bulky and unattractive additions to the dwelling, which are not suited to the wider street scene. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1

42. Residential amenity:

43. Policy DM1 amongst other matters, stipulates that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents. Additional residential amenity guidance is provided within the Council's Quality Places SPD.

44. The development accords with guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.

45. The dwellings benefit from good spacing between the neighbouring properties preventing overshadowing and there are no proposals for side windows to minimise overlooking.

46. The single storey rear extension is in line with the rear of the main property of no.65. Due to the orientation of the dwelling, the two-storey side extension predominantly faces the rear of the garden which is unlikely to cause overlooking of the no.65. The dormer is situated more towards the middle of the neighboring dwelling, therefore the side elevation obstructs this view towards their property.

47. On this basis the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring dwellings through overlooking, loss of light and loss of outlook.

48. Access and Parking Matters:

49. Policy DM14 requires an appropriate level of car parking to be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards, which for a four bedroom dwelling is three on site car parking spaces.

50. With the removal of the garage to erect the two-storey extension, there will be a loss of a parking space and also an additional bedroom. The requirement set out in the Parking Standards SPD for a 4no. bedroom dwelling is 3no. onsite parking spaces in which it seems that there would only be available space for 2no vehicles on the existing drive, however the front garden is large enough to create an additional space to meet the Council's parking requirements.

51. Sustainability Measures and Climate Change:

52. In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve

carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

53. The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

54. Other material considerations

55. There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.

56. There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

57. Equalities Implications:

58. Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:-

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

59. When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

60. Conclusion

61. The extension is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider locality. The application is recommended for refusal as it does not accord with the development plan.

H/23/95222

