

OFFICERS ASSESSMENT

Case Reference: 22/00932/HOU

Proposal: Two storey front, side and rear extensions; alterations and new roof over existing house (amended design following appeal APP/L1765/D/21/3286123).

Site Address: Stratton Highways Road Compton Hampshire SO21 2DF

Decision Type: Delegated Decision

Recommendation: Application Refused

Officer: Cameron Taylor

Date: 1 September 2022

Date of Site Visit:

EIA:

Extension of Time Date(if applicable)

Consultee:

Parish Consultation Letter

Officers Report:

Principle

The development is situated in the settlement boundary of Otterbourne, where the principle of development is acceptable, provided that the development is in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan and unless material planning reasons indicate otherwise.

Proposal

- Two storey front, side and rear extensions; alterations and new roof over existing house (amended design following appeal APP/L1765/D/21/3286123).

Planning History

-21/00782/HOU- (AMENDED PLANS) Two storey front, side and rear extensions; alterations and new roof over existing house (amended design and roof to that permitted under 08/01823/FUL)- Refused, appeal dismissed.

- 08/01823/FUL- two storey front, side and rear extensions; alterations and new roof over existing house- Permitted but no longer extant and cannot be lawfully implemented.

- 03/01873/FUL- Two and a half storey rear extension- Refused
- 85/01373/OLD- Erection of garage- Permitted

Impact on Property and Character of Area

-The site is located to the north of Highways Road. The property has had previous planning permission in 2008 which includes various extensions and alterations to the previous dwelling. The earlier consent also allowed the extended building to be finished in white render with hanging clay tiles and clay roof tiles. This permission has lapsed. The current proposal is for a two-storey front, side and rear extensions, alterations and new roof, amendments following the refusal and dismissal of the previous application. Highways Road is characterised by two-storey dwellings with no set building line and which vary in styles and eras of properties. However the buildings retain traditional external appearances. Despite the variety, there is a consistent character to the street arising from the common use of red brick and dark tiles and the dwellings. Also, while the houses are mostly large, they sit comfortably within each plot and the overall streetscape.

-The amendments from the refused scheme include the removal of the raised central section of the roof, a claimed reduction in roof height, the reinstatement of wing tips and projected eaves and the reinstatement of louvers on the front elevation.

-The scheme seeks to remove the raised central section of the roof, this is more in line with the original scheme permitted. However the dwelling still has a similar ridge height as the previous refused scheme. The removal of the central raised section, whilst it returns in part to the original design as approved, provides no clear reduction in the ridge height, with this height remaining at a similar level as that refused which was noted in the appeal "such an increase is significant" with the latest scheme not addressing the increase. As such, it still accentuates the building's prominence in the road. Therefore it is considered to be harmful to the character of the area.

-Reinstating the wing tips and projected eaves, along with the louvers to the front, to reflect the approved scheme is proposed. In addition to providing features similar to those originally permitted, it proposes a standing seam metal roof with a buff render external finish along with additional planting to the front of the dwelling. However, due to the overriding concerns about the massing, these changes in its appearance and some soft landscaping do not mitigate the harm created by the proposal. The inspectorate writes in paragraph 13.

"Whilst it could well be that an alternative colour paint for the render would reduce the incongruity of the dwelling, nonetheless on its own this would not alleviate my concerns" they go on further to say "soft landscaping would not mitigate the harm that ensues from the proposal". The latest scheme includes change in the materials and addition of soft landscaping, but as noted by the inspectorate these changes would not alleviate the concerns and harm which arises from the massing of the proposal. The inspectorate then states further in paragraph 13 of the appeal that they find it fails to comply with the NPPF paragraph 126 'high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings' and in conflict

with paragraph 130 as it fails to be visually attractive and is not sympathetic to local character.

-Therefore whilst the proposal reinstates elements approved under the original permission, there is still a significant increase in the overall massing of the dwelling through the height and additional changes across the site, the importance of massing is highlighted in the High Quality Places SPD under sections 3, 6, 7 paras 6.1 - 6.12; 6.17 - 6.26; 6.42 - 6.52; 7.1 - 7.8; 7.31-7.33; 7.54-7.61; 7.73 - 7.75 and all of 8 Extensions. The latest scheme remains in conflict with this which the inspectorate notes in paragraph 14. Therefore, in the context of the area it considered that the changes in regard to the massing, scale and height are not proportionate to the plot size or surrounding built form. These changes, in conjunction with the unsympathetic materials result in the proposal causing unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal does not comply with policies CP13, DS1 and MTRA 3 of the LPP1 and policies DM15 and DM16 of the LPP2.

The Compton & Shawford Village Design Statement November 2011 characterises houses in the area as generally set back from the road, in a linear aspect, with smaller front gardens and larger rear gardens. It also states that the existing form of linear development (such as that along Compton Street, within Compton Down, Southdown and Shawford) should be maintained. The linear character of the housing distribution can be seen in the map on the centre pages. Other forms of development should only be permitted where they would not adversely impact on the character of the area. As such the development is contrary to The Compton & Shawford Village Design Statement November 2011.

In the appeal decision the inspector found the proposal to be contrary to policy as below:

"The development is contrary to the NPPF 2021 para 126 which requires the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings, the development does not constitute good design which is a key aspect of sustainable development and the NPPF 2021 para 130, as it fails to be visually attractive and is unsympathetic to local character.

The development is contrary to Policies CP13, DS1 and MTRA3 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 and Policies DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 which together expect new developments to meet the highest standards of design, to respect the qualities, features and characteristics that contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area, including matters of scale and layout, whilst using high quality materials that are attractive and durable and appropriate to the context. The development is also contrary to the Council's High Quality Spaces SPD and the Compton & Shawford Village Design Statement November 2011 which, amongst other things, highlights the importance of massing which is often derived from the relationship the proposal has with neighbouring development."

It is concluded that the proposal fails to address these issues and in particular the massing issues which is drawn attention to in the VDS is demonstrably harmful to the area. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

Impact on residential amenity

-The proposal removes a number of wall mounted windows and has high level rooflights, which are unlikely to cause significant adverse overlooking impacts. Whilst the two-storey extension to the front will be visible from the living room of Fairfield and the increase in the roof height would be visible from the amenity area of Cottage. It is considered that these elements whilst increasing the massing, they would not materially increase the overbearing impacts. Therefore the proposal complies with policies DM17.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the property. The proposal therefore does not comply with policies CP13, DS1, MTRA3 of LPP1 and DM1, DM15 and DM16 of LPP2 and High Quality Places SPD, the Compton & Shawford Village Design Statement November 2011 and the requirements of the NPPF 2021.

Representation

Application Refused subject to the following condition(s):

Recommended Conditions

01 The proposed extensions and alterations, by virtue of their size, scale, height and resultant massing, materials and appearance do not respond positively to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or local area thereby having an incongruous and intrusive visual impact as seen from the public and private realm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CP13, DS1 and MTRA3 of Winchester District Local Plan Part 1, DM15 and DM16 of Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 and The High Quality Places SPD (Part 6, 7 and 8) and the Compton & Shawford Village Design Statement November 2011 and the requirements of the NPPF 2021.

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Policy CP13, DS1 and MTRA3 of Winchester District Local Plan Part 1

DM15 and DM16 of Winchester District Local Plan Part 2

The High Quality Places SPD (Part 6, 7 and 8)

Compton & Shawford Village Design Statement November 2011
NPPF 2021.

2. In accordance with the NPPF 2021 Winchester City Council (WCC) has taken a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, working with applicants and agents to achieve the best solution. To this end WCC:

- offer a pre-application advice service and,
- update applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application, where possible suggesting alternative solutions.

End of Report