

Planning Committee



Application Address	32 Addington Place Christchurch BH23 3PB
Proposal	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension (amended).
Application Number	8/23/0027/HOU
Applicant	Mrs J Bennett
Agent	Mr Matt Bell
Ward and Ward Member(s)	Christchurch Town Cllr Cox Cllr Tarling
Report status	Public Report
Meeting date	15 June 2023
Summary of Recommendation	Grant, subject to conditions
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Call-in by Cllr Cox on the following grounds; <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Impact on neighbours from increased bulk and scale• Effect on amenity space for neighbours be detrimental and out of character to area.• Development contrary to policies HE2 and HE3
Case Officer	Sophie Mawdsley

Description of Proposal

1. This application seeks permission for a 2-storey side extension with a single storey extension to rear. The proposals would provide an additional bedroom creating a four bedroom property and additional living space at ground floor level.

2. During the determination of the application, the plans and description of development have been revised with the following;
 - Remove the new external front door and replace with a bay window the match the existing front face bay.
 - Remove first floor rear extension
3. Following receipt of the amended plans, further publicity was undertaken.

Description of Site and Surroundings

4. The application site lies within the urban area east of Christchurch town centre. The surrounding area is characterised by an estate of Georgian-influenced terrace houses based around central squares, located south of Purewell roundabout and west of Stanpit. This is an established residential area with a well-defined settlement pattern. Parking is typically located in the centre of the squares and in garage courts located behind the properties. The wider estate borders the Purewell Conservation Area to the north and east.
5. The application property is a 2-storey end of terrace which sits at the northern edge of a square fronting a central green and is typical of the surrounding development. There are several trees located within the central area of the square, surrounding the parking area, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. There is a small stream running off to the east of the property, with more tree coverage; however, these are not protected. Behind the row of terraces there is a garage court for occupiers of Addington Place.
6. The wider estate of which Addington Place forms part of, is owned and managed by a Management Company and all homeowners are shareholders. The grounds and pathways are owned by the shareholders.
7. The application site partly falls within current flood zone 2 and in future high risk flood zone 3a (2133).

Relevant Planning History

8. 8/22/1038/PAL 32 Addington Place, Christchurch, BH23 3PB 2-storey side extension. First floor rear extension. Written response given 04/01/2023

8/20/0866/HOU 32 Addington Place, Christchurch, BH23 3PB Single storey side extension with a parapet wall around a flat roof with roof lanterns. Granted 12/01/2021

Constraints

Flood Zone 2 current
Flood Zone 3a 30cc 2093
Flood Zone 3a 40cc 2133
SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Heathland 5km Consultation Area
Airport Safeguarding

Public Sector Equalities Duty

9. In accordance with section 149 Equality Act 2010, in considering this proposal due regard has been had 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.

Other relevant duties

10. In accordance with section 40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, in considering this application, regard has been had, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of this function, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.
11. For the purposes of this application, in accordance with section 17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998, due regard has been had to, including the need to do all that can reasonably be done to prevent, (a) crime and disorder in its area (including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment); (b) the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in its area; and (c) re-offending in its area.

Consultations

12. **Wessex Water** - No objection
13. **Christchurch Town Council** – Objection due to;
- the bulk and massing,
 - being out of character with the existing developments,
 - detrimental effect on neighbouring residences' amenity space, and
 - incompatibility with Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Policies HE2 (Design of New Development) and HE3 (Landscape Quality).
14. **BCP Trees & Landscaping** - Requested a Tree Protection Plan showing location to be used for storing and mixing of materials, siting of services, drainage, soakaways etc.

Representations

15. 24 separate representations objecting to the scheme (including prior to and post the further publicity) have been received as well as a petition with 53 signatures. The concerns are summarised below:

The design

- The bulk and scale hugely impacts the symmetry and appearance of the neo-Georgian estate.
- Bay windows are not in keeping with symmetry of estate where properties have one bay window and one front door.
- The design, although pushed back 1.5m, does not reduce the impact on the square or lessen the appearance which is totally out of keeping.
- Allowing an extension, where none have been done previously, will result in a dangerous precedent.
- The homeowners have listed the property for sale, so are just doing this for resale value potential have already got planning permission in place for a more modest extension.
- The proposal features an external door to access the new playroom, which we feel is not necessary.
- May affect the value of nearby properties
- Will impact on everyone else and detrimental to the look and feel of the area.
- Out of character and harm uniqueness of estate
- Direct contravention of the existing vista.
- Overdevelopment
- This building could also have an impact on the flood problem which occurs periodically here on the estate.
- The original approved planning application for the property was for a single storey office extension which has now been substantially changed to a two storey 4/5 bedroomed house.
- The changes will mean building a brick wall approximately 6.9 metres high and 12.0 metres long, which will be only 9.5 metres from my front door, number 28, and 6.5 metres from the front door of number 30.
- It is noted that windows are proposed for the side elevation where none currently exist on Riverslea 2 this would not be in keeping with the estate and potentially impact other properties.

Impact on neighbours

- Loss of light and view from side wall of extension – replacing existing 2m garden boundary wall.
- Would affect the right of light, privacy and peaceful enjoyment of the property by neighbouring houses.
- The proposal will cause considerable disruption to this private estate by way of building materials, mechanical equipment and scaffolding used during the construction phase.
- The proposal will result in unacceptable congestion and obstruction to homes and garages at the rear of 34-40 Addington Place (the hard top the property of the Management Company). Access is needed at all times to garages 24 – 40 (number 30 needs access for a mobility scooter).
- Insufficient parking for numerous contractors. And shareholders do not give their permission for contractors to access the property using the footpaths, garage court etc.
- Concern has been expressed at the impact to the wastewater systems with the potential for increased occupancy leading to higher usage, the precedent set would potentially allow others to do similar and the local wastewater systems will in our client's opinion not cope.
- Impact on parking in the adjacent council owned parking areas, there is only a single garage demised to the property within the estate, the facilities for additional parking would therefore likely be inadequate or impact on the rest of the residents.
- A high proportion of the estate residents are older and do not wish to have such extensive and long-term development occurring within their quiet estate.

In addition, a number of comments were made in respect of a covenant affecting the site and the wider estate. The potential relevance of this is set out in para. 42 below.

Key Issues

16. The key issues involved with this proposal are:

- The impact upon the character of the area
- The impact on neighbours' living conditions
- Trees and Landscape
- Flood risk

17. These issues will be considered along with other matters relevant to this proposal below.

Policy Context

18. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan for an area,

except where material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in this case comprises Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy (2014) and saved policies of the Christchurch Local Plan (2001).

The following policies are of particular relevance in this case:

KS1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
KS2	Settlement Hierarchy
KS11	Transport and Development
KS12	Parking Provision
ME6	Flood Management, Mitigation and Defence
HE2	Design of new development
HE3	Landscape Quality

Christchurch Local Plan (2001) – Saved Policies

H12	Residential infill development
-----	--------------------------------

19. **Supplementary Planning Documents;**

Parking Standards SPD 2022
Christchurch Borough-Wide Character assessment (2003)

20. **National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”/”Framework”)**

Including in particular the following:

Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Paragraph 11 –

“Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

.....

For **decision-taking** this means:

- (c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- (d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 - (i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of this Framework taken as a whole.”

Section 12 Achieving well-designed places

Planning Assessment

Principle of development

21. The site lies within the urban area and the proposal is acceptable in principle under the settlement strategy in Policy KS2. The extension is to enlarge an existing residential

dwelling within the urban area and settlement boundaries.

22. Planning permission has been granted for a single storey side extension in 2021; however, it has not yet been implemented.

The impact upon the character of the area

23. Policy HE2 states that 'the design of a development must be of a high quality, reflecting and enhancing areas of recognised local distinctiveness'. The development must be compatible with or improve its surrounding in its layout; site coverage; architectural style; scale; bulk; height; materials and visual impact.
24. The proposal seeks to add a 2-storey side extension to the host property and a single storey extension to the existing addition at the rear of the dwelling. The extension would be set back from the front elevation by 1.5 metres and therefore it would not appear prominent in the street scene or from views along Palmerston Avenue. The extensions would be visible above the garage courts from Pelham Close; however, they would not appear intrusive in the street scene.
25. The design of both the side and rear extension would complement the design and form of the host property with materials and fenestration detailing to match. The extensions would increase the size of the property; however, the plot is considered to be large enough to accommodate the development. The proposed extension is well designed and sympathetic to the scale, character and appearance of the existing property and is also subservient. It will appear as a well-considered and appropriate addition to the existing property.
26. Strong concerns have been raised in the representations about the loss of the symmetry of the square and the terrace and the detrimental impact on the character and uniqueness of this estate. However, the extension would be recessed from the front elevation, limiting its impact on views of the terrace from the square and given the design form and scale of the extension it is considered that the proposal respects the established character of the locality and does not harm the wider character of the area. The proposals would preserve the existing appearance of the square.
27. The side elevation would feature one small high level window at ground floor level. It is noted that no other end terraces on the estate feature side facing windows, however that elevation would not be visible from the street and would only be seen by people using the footpath to access the garage court. Furthermore, installation of a ground floor window to the side of the existing property would be permitted development. The original proposal included a separate front door at the front of the property to serve the playroom. The proposal has since been amended to remove this door and replace with a bay to maintain the symmetry of the design and to be more in keeping with the style of the host property and surrounding properties.
28. It is concluded that the extensions to the side and rear are compatible to the character and form of the existing properties and would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the area. The proposal, therefore, complies with policy HE2 and saved policy H12.

Residential Amenity

29. Policy HE2 states that; 'development will be permitted if it compatible with or improves its surroundings in; its relationship to nearby properties including minimising disturbance to amenity'. Saved policy H12 states that residential development should not adversely affect residential amenities by noise or disturbance, or loss of light or privacy.
30. The extension would sit adjacent to No. 30 Addington Place, separated by a footpath and the neighbour's front area of garden. Due to the positioning of the properties, the extension would not be sited forward of this neighbour. No 32 is sited to the northeast of No 30 and there is approximately 7 metres between the side extension and the side of No 30. However, it is considered that due to the separation and its height, the side extension would not cause unacceptable overshadowing or a loss of sunlight to this neighbour. The extension will be visible from the front of No. 30 and the remainder of this terrace to the south, however, it is not considered to cause harm to these neighbours' outlook.
31. Due to the extension being set back from the front elevation, this limits its impact to neighbours. The side elevation would feature a ground floor high level window which would not provide views to any private garden areas. The proposed first floor rear facing bedroom window would have views to the north of the garage court and the open space between the properties and the proposed doors at ground level would provide views into the application property's garden. As a result, they would not result in any levels of harmful overlooking into neighbouring dwellings.
32. The rear extension would be partly visible from the adjacent property and garden; however, it is not considered that it would result in harm to the outlook from the rear of the dwelling on account of its flat roof design and being offset from the common boundary. The ground floor addition would be an extension to the existing rear extension which would remain at 2.8 metres off the side boundary and only the top element would be visible above the fence. The structure is not considered to harm the living conditions of the adjoining neighbours.
33. Given the residential nature of the extensions and the established residential locality, there is no reason to believe that the addition of these extensions would result in an increase in noise or disturbance within this area. Any potential disruption during construction would be a temporary impact.
34. The proposal is considered to comply with the test in Policy HE2 to be compatible with or improve its surroundings in its relationship to nearby properties including minimising general disturbance to amenity.

Trees and Landscape

35. Policy HE2 states that development will be permitted if it is compatible with or improve its surroundings in its relationship to mature trees and Policy HE3 states: '*Development will need to protect and seek to enhance the landscape character of the area*' and proposals need to have demonstrated that natural features such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, water features and wildlife corridors have been taken into account. Saved policy H12 refers to residential development seeks to ensure development does not result

in the loss of an important landscape or other environmental feature such as open space or trees.

36. The NPPF, in paragraph 131 recognises that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environment and can help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Trees should be retained wherever possible.
37. The extensions do not have a direct impact on the trees to the front of the site within the square or to the west adjacent to the stream; however, it is considered reasonable to request details of any new services and the storage of materials and equipment during the construction phase in order to ensure that trees within the vicinity of the site are not harmed by the development. It is considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of any trees and is compliant with policies HE2, HE3 and H12.

Flooding

38. Local Plan Policy ME6 states; *'all developments (including redevelopments and extensions which require planning permission) can be permitted within areas at risk of flooding they will be required to incorporate appropriate flood resistance and resilience measures as a means of "future proofing" against the effects of climate change.'*
39. Both Policy ME6 and the NPPF take a sequential approach to new development. This proposal is considered to be 'minor' development in flood risk terms and therefore the Sequential Test is not applicable to this proposal as set out in paragraph 168 of the NPPF. Although the application property is located within current flood zone 2 and future flood zone 3a, a flood risk assessment form has been submitted which states that the floor levels of the extension will not be lower than those of the existing property, and that flood proofing of the proposed development will be incorporated where appropriate. The site is not subject to surface water flooding; however, it is recognised that there is some surface water flooding to the west close to the stream.
40. The scheme therefore complies with the requirement set out in Policy ME6 and Flood Risk Standing Advice as set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance. A condition is proposed to ensure the floor levels are the same as the existing property.

Parking and Access

41. Policies KS11 and KS12 refer to the design of development to provide safe and permeable layouts and promoting all modes of transport alongside parking provision. This proposal does not change the parking or access for this property. The dwelling benefits from a garage space within the garage court to the rear of the property. The extensions would result in an increase in the number of bedrooms within the dwelling; however, the site is within Zone B as set out in the Parking SPD and for a four-bedroom property the requirement is for one parking space. Therefore, it is considered the parking provision is acceptable and accords with Policy KS12.

Other matters

42. The representations refer to a covenant that exists preventing altering the look of any

property within the estate, and that for any works to be undertaken, permission must be sought from Shareholders of which all homeowners are one. This covenant is not a planning matter and any requirements for the applicant to comply with the covenant are a private matter.

43. Neighbours have raised concern about damage to pathways that are owned and maintained by the shareholders, disturbance and noise during construction, access and parking for contractors and effect on elderly residents during the process. They are noted, but some of these issues are civil matters and for a development of this scale, it would not be reasonable to control hours of construction and parking of contractors as there is separate legislation available to address any noise impacts or obstruction of public highways.

Planning Balance/Conclusion

44. It is considered that the proposed extension would be sympathetic in design and scale to both the existing character of the dwelling and the wider estate and the form of the existing property. Setting the extension back from the front elevation prevents it being overly prominent in the street scene, helping to retain the uniform design of the square. The proposal therefore complies with Policy HE2 and H12 in its to visual impact, architectural style, scale and materials.
45. The side facing window, whilst a feature not found elsewhere in the estate, will not be highly visible from the street scene as it would face out onto an area of green space and a footpath that leads to the garage court. The extensions are not considered to have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining and adjacent residential properties by reason of their design and separation from neighbours.
46. The scheme therefore has acceptable environmental, social and economic impacts. Having considered the appropriate development plan policies and other material considerations, including the NPPF, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the development, would accord with the Development Plan. Subject to conditions the proposal is acceptable, and according to NPPF paragraph 11(c) development should be approved without delay.

Recommendation

47. Grant, subject to the following conditions
1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

MBA/100/001 A Existing Location Plans
MBA/100/004 A Proposed Location Plans

MBA/100/005 B Proposed Floor Plans
MBA/100/006 B Proposed Elevations

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The materials and finishes to be employed on the external faces of the development, hereby permitted, shall match those of the existing building unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, a Tree Protection Plan in accordance with BS:5837 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan must include details of the area used for storing and mixing of materials (which must be within the site boundary), the siting of services, drainage and/or a soakaway, if required. Development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved Protection Plan.

Reason: In order to protect the TPO tree during construction of the development hereby approved.

5. The finished floor levels of the extensions hereby approved shall be no lower than the existing finished floor levels of the existing property.

Reason: To prevent flood risk to the property.

Background Documents:

Documents uploaded to that part of the Council's website that is publicly accessible and specifically relates to the application the subject of this report including all formal consultation response and representations submitted by the applicant in respect of the application. Notes: This excludes all documents which are considered to contain exempt information for the purposes of Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972.