

Monday, 25 March 2024

Objection to Application H/24/96887

Site Address: 17b Hazel Close, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 5RF

Description: Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

Introduction:

This objection letter relates to application H/24/96887, which is a householder planning application for the erection of a two-storey side extension, and single-storey rear extension at 17b Hazel Close, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 5RF.

Relevant Planning History:

Reference Number:	Description:	Decision:
F/10/68252	Erection of a pair of 3 bed semi-detached dwellings with associated detached garages and attached garage to No.17 Hazel Close	Refused 18 th May 2011; subsequently allowed at appeal 22 November 2011.

Relevant Planning Policy:

National Planning Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide (NDG)

Local Planning Policy:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

DM1: General criteria for new development

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Discussion of Scheme:

Procedural Issues:

Having attempted to measure the provided plans, it appears that the scales shown are incorrect; the provided elevation plans appear to be at 1:75 scale, rather than the 1:100 claimed; it is considered that plans at the correct scale should be provided, to ensure consistency in decision making and the planning process.

Design and Visual Amenity:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that all developments will add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, establish and maintain a strong sense of place using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF goes on to state that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that achieving good design “is about creating places, buildings, or places that work well for everyone, look good, and will adapt to the needs of future generations.”

Policy DM1 states that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance the character and appearance of urban areas, and should take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

The host dwelling forms half of a semi-detached pair. The proposed 2-storey side extension is significant in size, in terms of footprint, height and general and massing. Though it is clear that some effort has been made to ensure that the proposal appears subservient to the host dwelling, it is not considered that the extremely minor set down from the ridge line is successful in doing so; this is exacerbated by the significant volume increase which would result in a increase in bulk and massing which does not appear suitably subservient to the existing dwelling, harming the visual amenity of the host and the surrounding area. Due to the significant width of the proposed side extension, which would almost double the volume of the existing dwelling, it would be considered to unduly dominate its host, lacking subservience and clearly having been designed to maximise space, rather than being design led.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would lead to visual harm to both the character of the locality, and the surrounding area, and accordingly the application should be refused.

Residential Amenity:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF sets out six criteria against which planning decisions should meet to deliver well-designed places. This includes criteria (f), which requires development to “create places ... with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.”

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that achieving good design “is about creating places, buildings, or places that work well for everyone, look good, and will adapt to the needs of future generations.”

Policy DM1 states that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

The proposed two-storey side extension would sit extend within extremely close proximity to the site’s side boundary, which is shared with No. 7 Walnut Close. The brick elevation would measure 4.8m in height, with a further 2m to the ridge, with the extension measuring around 6.75m overall.

The flank elevation would sit directly adjacent to the rear garden of No. 7 Walnut Close, resulting in a blank, brick wall extending across a significant portion of the garden boundary. This would result in significant overbearing impacts on the amenity space of No. 7, to the detriment of the residential amenity of its residents.

Furthermore, the proximity of this tall structure next to the boundary would result in a loss of light to the rear garden; this would be exacerbated by the fact that the new structure would be located to the south of the garden, meaning that significant amounts of light would be blocked at almost all points of the day.

Furthermore, the southern elevation of No. 7 Walnut Close has a number of windows to the ground and first-floor which serve habitable rooms. Due to the siting of the extension, the development would result in a tall, blank, brick elevation around 10m from these windows, resulting in significantly worse outlook, and extreme overbearing and overshadowing impacts.

As such, it is not considered that the proposal complies with Policy DM1, or the relevant provisions of the NPPF, and as such, permission should be refused.

Conclusion

Firstly, it is believed that the provided plans have been incorrectly scaled. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal would result in significant visual and residential amenity impacts, and as such, the application should be refused.