

# Planning Committee



Application Address	44 Minterne Road Christchurch BH23 3LE
Proposal	Demolition of existing garage. Erection of 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension & creation of 1st floor accommodation
Application Number	8/24/0720/HOU
Applicant	Michal Lydka
Agent	Mr J Isaacs
Ward and Ward Member(s)	Mudford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe Cllr Lesley Dedman Cllr Paul Hilliard
Report status	Public
Meeting date	20 February 2025
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	<b>Refuse for the reason(s) set out below</b>
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Applicant is a direct family member (spouse) of an Officer working within the planning section.
Case Officer	Charlotte Haines
Is the proposal EIA development	No

## **Description of Proposal**

1. This application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey side extension following the demolition of the existing detached garage and the enlargement of the roof to create first floor accommodation.
2. The application follows the grant of planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension following the demolition of the existing detached garage and the enlargement of the roof to create first floor accommodation.
3. Amended plans were submitted by the agent during the course of the application. The main change is the introduction of a half-hipped element to the part of the extension closest to the boundary with the neighbour. The remainder of the

extension would retain a flat roof with the front and rear elevation comprising of vertical slate clad upper walls.

### **Description of Site and Surroundings**

4. The application site lies within a cul de sac within the residential area of Stanpit. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of two storey houses and bungalows. Minterne Road is characterised by predominantly detached single storey bungalows and chalet bungalows. These bungalows are varied in terms of scale, design, style and massing.
5. The application site consists of a hipped roof bungalow and is typical of the surrounding development in the road. The dwelling is set back in its plot with off-road parking.
6. The application site partly falls within future high risk flood zone 3a (2133).

### **Relevant Planning History**

8/24/0318/HOU	44 Minterne Road Christchurch BH23 3LE	Alterations and remodel of the existing dwelling inclusive of demolition of the existing garage, single storey rear and side extension and creation of first floor accommodation	Granted	30/09/24
8/21/0813/HOU	46 Minterne Road Christchurch BH23 3LE	Single storey rear extension.	Granted	11/11/21
8/13/0344	40 Minterne Road	Create gable ends and insert dormer window to side to create accommodation in the roofspace. Erection of single storey extension to rear	Granted	28/08/13
8/06/0328	44 Minterne Road	Construct pitched roof over existing flat roof extension to rear	Granted	14/08/06
8/03/0075	44 Minterne Road	Erection of single storey pitched roof extension and replacement garage with pitched roof	Granted	25/03/03
8/01/0346	44 Minterne Road	Single-storey rear extension with pitched roof above. Erection of detached garage to rear following demolition of existing.	Granted	31/07/01

## **Constraints**

7. Future Flood Zone 3a (Year 2133)

## **Public Sector Equalities Duty**

8. 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**

9. 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.
10. For the purposes of this application, in accordance with section 2 Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, regard has been had to the register that the Council maintains of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots in the Council's area for their own self-build and custom housebuilding.
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. **Christchurch Town Council** – No comments have been received.

## **Representations**

13. 1 objection has been received from the adjacent neighbour in which the following summarised concerns were raised:
- Proximity and height of the proposed building will severely impact the natural light entering their home;
  - Choice of black cladding on the first floor is likely to exacerbate the loss of light as it will absorb sunlight.

## **Key Issues**

14. The key issue(s) involved with this proposal are:
- The impact upon the character of the area
  - The impact on neighbours' living conditions
  - Flood Risk
  - Parking and Highway Safety

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

## **Policy Context**

16. 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 the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan and saved policies of the Christchurch Local Plan 2001.

### 17. Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy 2014

KS1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
KS11	Transport and Development
KS12	Parking Provision
HE2	Design of new development
H12	Residential Infill
ME6	Flood Management, Mitigation and Defence

### 18. Saved Policies of the Christchurch Local Plan 2001

H12: Residential Infill

### 19. Draft BCP Local Plan

20. The draft BCP Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 27 June 2024 for examination. The Local Plan examination is expected to take around 12 months. If approved by the Inspectors, the Local Plan will replace the current Local Plans around the middle of 2025. Due to the stage the Plan has reached, the majority of policies are attracting very limited weight at this time. Although a small number attract a limited weight at this time including the following relevant policy:

Policy BE3: Living conditions

21. This draft policy is broadly in line with the existing relevant policies HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy 2014 and saved policy H12 Christchurch Local Plan 2001; namely that proposals should be compatible with surrounding uses; not result in an unacceptable impact upon public amenity or the living conditions of current or future occupiers considering overlooking, overshadowing, privacy, noise, levels of sunlight and daylight and whether the development is overbearing or oppressive.

### 22. Supplementary Planning Documents

Parking Standards SPD 2022

Christchurch Borough-Wide Character Assessment (2003)

### 23. National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF"/"Framework")

#### 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

The requirement for good design set out in section 12; paragraph 135 requires that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Development that is not well designed, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design should be refused (para 139).

## Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Paragraph 172 - All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by:

- a) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below;
- b) safeguarding land from development that is required, or likely to be required, for current or future flood management;
- c) using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding, (making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management); and
- d) where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to relocate development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.

Paragraph 181 advises that when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;

- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

Paragraph 176 states that applications for some minor development and changes of use (footnote 60) should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.

Footnote 62 - This includes **householder development**, small non-residential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250m<sup>2</sup>) and changes of use; except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site, where the sequential and exception tests should be applied as appropriate.

## **Planning Assessment**

### **The Impact upon the Character of the Area**

- 24. 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.
- 25. The existing property is single storey and is lower in height than the neighbouring properties on either side. Furthermore, the existing bungalow is smaller in size than the other bungalows within the road.
- 26. This application is proposing the enlargement of the existing single storey bungalow to a chalet style bungalow. The design has a symmetrical single gable that runs front to back of the property.
- 27. The original properties within the road typically comprised single storey bungalows with modest hipped roofs and are set back from the highway. However, a number of properties in the vicinity of the site have been given permission to extend up into the roof space or demolish the existing bungalow for a chalet bungalow with accommodation in the roof. Therefore, the design and form of the dwellings within the street scene has changed over recent years resulting in a mixed character of bungalows and more modern looking chalet style bungalows. The addition of a half storey and the proposed gable roof form in terms of design would not be competing visually on the street scene despite appearing more conspicuous.
- 28. There is no set style of property on the road to adhere to. Whilst the form of the new roof would substantially differ from the existing, it would retain a similar roof pitch, and the increased height is not considered significant having regard to the varying heights within the street scene.
- 29. Whilst the proposed dwelling house would adopt a similar gable form to the adjacent property at no.40, as well as a number of other properties in the road; the proposed design, fenestration and materials would result in a more contemporary finish.
- 30. The proposed extensions would result in a dwelling that has a larger footprint and volume than the existing bungalow, with a ridge height of approximately 6.9m, which represents an increase of approximately 1.7m. This would also exceed the ridge

heights of the properties on either side by approximately 0.7m (No.40) and 1.3m (No.46).

31. The proposed ridge height and eaves height of the enlarged bungalow would also only be marginally greater than the previously approved scheme. It was accepted in assessing the previously approved scheme that this would result in a noticeable increase in height, it was not considered that this would lead to an incongruous and overbearing form of development in the street scene given the variation in heights and roof forms along the road and within immediate vicinity of the site. Given the marginal difference, it is considered the same conclusion can be drawn in respect of the current proposal.
32. The proposed and dormer window in the previous scheme was noted to further increase the mass and bulk of the roof however this was only a modest addition. In comparison, the current proposal seeks a two-storey side extension that primarily has a flat roof instead of the dormer window which would substantially increase the mass and bulk of the overall dwelling so that it has the appearance of a larger two storey dwelling. This contrasts significantly with the surrounding development which comprises of a more modest single storey bungalows or chalet bungalows with dormers.
33. In terms of materials, the proposed use of white render to the walls is considered acceptable and is prevalent in the surrounding development. Whilst not commonplace in the road, the use of slate effect tiles for the roof is evidenced on a number of extended roofs of surrounding properties within the surrounding area. The upper cladding of the first-floor level of the two storey extension would comprise of a similar slate tiles to match those on the roof and would be read in relation to this with render to match on the lower walls.
34. The previously approved scheme included a wraparound rear/side extension which would extend up to the side boundaries leaving narrow gaps. Whilst accepted that a number of properties in road have substantially filled the plots, these typically comprise of the pitched roofs of the bungalows with the lower eave's height close to the boundary or the addition of single storey side extensions extend up to the side boundary leaving narrow gaps. In contrast, the proposal would introduce a two-storey extension with an eave's height of approximately 5m up to the boundary.
35. The proposed extension, by reason of its largely flat roof design is also inconsistent with the steep pitched gable roof of the chalet bungalow. Whilst amended plans were submitted which introduces a small half hipped element on the side closest to the boundary with the neighbour, the front and rear elevations would comprise of a vertical slate cladded wall. It is therefore considered that the proposed two storey extension would not be subservient to the enlarged building introducing a bulky incongruous feature that would fail to have an appropriate relationship to its plot and spacing within the road.
36. The single storey extension would extend into the rear to a depth of 4.4m from the rear elevation of the chalet bungalow (the one and half storey element) which would not extend so far to the rear of the plot that it would be out of character in the context of the locality.
37. The proposed first floor alterations to the existing bungalow would not be out of keeping in a varied street scene and would have an acceptable relationship with the adjacent properties. Due to the varying ridge heights within the road, it is not considered that the change in ridge heights would appear out of character within the street scene. However, the proposed two storey extension is not considered to be

compatible to the enlarged dwelling and would result an overly large building on the plot that would fail to relate to existing development within the road.

38. It is considered that the proposed roof alterations to create the first floor and the rear extension would result in a development that is compatible to the character of the site and surrounding area. However, the proposed two storey extension is not considered to be subservient to the dwelling and would fail to respect the character and spacing of properties within the road. Therefore, the proposed two storey extension would not be compatible to the character and form of the existing properties within the road and would adversely affect the visual amenities of the area. The proposal, therefore, is considered to be contrary to policy HE2 and saved policy H12.

#### Residential Amenity

39. 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.
40. The previously approved scheme had the first-floor development proposed above the existing footprint of the host dwelling which is set away from the boundary with no.46 by approximately 5m. The current scheme also has the first floor development above the existing footprint however it also extends over the proposed single storey side extension. This two-storey extension would result in first-floor development being brought closer to this neighbour. The proposed two storey extension would be approximately 0.6m from the boundary with this neighbour at its closest point and 0.9m at its furthest point.
41. The original plans submitted with the application showed this to have a flat roof. However, amended plans were submitted during the course of the application to modify the roof design of the two-storey extension. This amended design would still incorporate a flat roof however a small, hipped roof element has been introduced adjacent to the boundary with the neighbour. The flat roof has a height of 6.3m and the half-hipped element would slope down to an eaves level measuring approximately 5m in height. The proposed two storey extension extends approximately 7m along the boundary from front to rear and parallel to the side elevation of no.46.
42. It is noted that there are a set of windows on the side elevation of the neighbouring dwelling which serve as the sole windows to habitable rooms (dining room and office). The proposed two storey extension would be approximately 1.5m from these windows and is also located to the southeast of these windows. Therefore, the proposed extension would lead to significant overshadowing which would diminish the levels of light entering these windows of these habitable rooms.
43. Given the close proximity of the proposed two storey extension coupled with the overall height and depth and its location to the southeast, it would lead to a significant loss of outlook and light to the habitable rooms of this neighbouring property.
44. No windows are proposed on the side elevation of the extension and as a result there would be no overlooking. There are windows on the front and rear elevations. This includes a full height window on the rear elevation however this would have oblique views towards the side elevation of the rear extension at No.46 where there is a window. The window would have a Juliette balcony preventing it from becoming an opening onto the flat roof area over the single storey rear extension. This would



avoid any overlooking into neighbouring properties. The front window would overlook the driveway and road beyond with oblique views towards the side elevation of No.46 however there are no window openings forward of the proposed two storey extension and as such the front window would not overlook any habitable rooms of this neighbouring property.

45. Whilst increasing the height and massing of the roof to the host dwelling, which would be a relatively steep pitch, the dwelling is broadly in line with the neighbouring properties on either side. As a result, it is not considered the increased height of the roof over the existing bungalow would result in any significant adverse impacts as a result of loss of light or overbearing impact to this neighbour.
46. Whilst the existing bungalow is perpendicular to the road, the side boundary with the property to the southeast (No.40) extends into the rear at an angle. Consequently, the bungalow has a greater proximity to this boundary as it extends further into the plot. The rear corner of the existing bungalow is approximately 0.7m from this boundary. The neighbouring chalet bungalow at no.40 is also positioned close to the bungalow. Therefore, there is already a close built relationship between the existing dwelling on the site and this neighbouring property.
47. The existing bungalow extends slightly further into the rear than that of No.40 by approximately 0.9m. Therefore, the increased height of the bungalow would project beyond the rear elevation of No.40 where there are rear facing windows and patio doors. The increased eaves height would be approximately 1.3m and the overall height of the roof pitches away from this boundary. Furthermore, the nearest window on the rear elevation of this neighbouring property is set further away from the boundary at a distance of approximately 1.7m. This window also forms part of a wider set of windows and patio doors which serve a living room that face over the neighbours' garden. The proposed first floor extension would not break the 45-degree horizontal or vertical splay and is therefore deemed not to create harmful oppressive impacts to this neighbour.
48. The proposed single storey extension would extend further to the rear and would bring built form of the dwelling closer to the boundary at approximately 0.3m. However, the extension is single storey in height measuring approximately 3.5m with a flat roof. The proposed single storey extension would break the horizontal splay but would not break the vertical splay.
49. Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal single storey rear extension would not lead to a significant loss of outlook or light, nor would it have a significant overbearing impact on the neighbouring property at No.40.
50. The proposed rear extension would extend to a similar depth to the rear extension at No.46. The proposed extension would be approximately 0.9m from the boundary and approximately 1.5m from the side elevation of the neighbours' rear extension where a window is present. However, it is noted that an existing garage is positioned this location and within a similar proximity to the boundary. The proposed single storey extension at 3.5m high would be of the same ridge height as the existing garage albeit due to its flat roof design this would be the height across the entire bulk of the extension. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that the increased height and amount of built form of the proposed rear extension compared to the existing garage would lead to an overbearing impact to the neighbour at No.46 having regard to its single storey scale.

51. The front facing gable would have a large first floor window proposed which will overlook the road and as such would not result in a loss of privacy to any of the neighbouring properties.
52. The side facing rooflights on the southeast would serve a staircase/landing (a non-habitable space) and as secondary openings to the bedrooms 1 and 2. The rooflights would face towards a side facing dormer window at no.40. Had permission been recommended, this would have been subject to a condition for these rooflights to be obscure glazed and non-opening to prevent any overlooking.
53. The side facing rooflight on the northwest elevation would be a secondary opening to bedroom 2. Had permission been recommended, this would have been subject to a condition for these rooflights to be obscure glazed and non-opening to prevent any overlooking.
54. The proposed new rear facing window will serve a bedroom. Whilst this will result in the introduction of a level of overlooking towards the properties to the south west which front onto Stanpit. However, the window-to-window distances would be in excess of 35m and would be acceptable. The significant separation distances involved, it is considered that there would be no harmful overlooking towards these neighbouring properties to the south and they would retain acceptable privacy levels and thereby acceptable living conditions. The proposed new rear facing window would have oblique views towards the neighbouring gardens to the southeast of the properties which front onto Victoria Road, notably no.2. However, the first-floor window would be approximately 25m from the rear elevation of this boundary. Whilst it would be closer to the rear boundary of the property at approximately 15m, any views would be onto the very bottom of this neighbouring garden which itself is less private and already overlooked by surrounding properties.
55. This window is set back from the rear elevation between flank walls and as such would adequately minimise any opportunity for overlooking. Direct views out of this window would be towards the very bottom of the gardens of the adjacent properties on either side. It is noted that this would be a Juliette balcony meaning that there would be no opportunity to step onto a balcony thus avoiding views to either side. It is considered necessary to condition that the window to remain in its recessed position in order to ensure that the flank walls provide the screening that minimises overlooking.
56. Whilst there would be new overlooking of neighbouring gardens from the windows on the rear elevation, it is not considered to be so materially harmful that planning permission should be refused. Due consideration has been given to the reasonable fall-back position regarding Permitted Development (PD) in this regard.
57. The flat roof over the single storey rear extension is in line with the lower edge of the full height window/Juliette balcony. It is considered that the use of the flat roof as a terrace would lead to unacceptable overlooking to neighbouring gardens resulting in loss of privacy and disturbance to the occupiers of these neighbouring properties. Had permission been recommended, this would have been subject to a condition to restrict the flat roof area of the proposed extension from being used as an external balcony, terrace or amenity space without the prior benefit of planning permission.
58. It is therefore considered that proposed extensions to the dwelling would not give rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking to the adjoining properties and as such would not lead to loss of privacy to these neighbours.

59. The enlarged dwelling would retain adequate private amenity space for future occupiers.
60. Notwithstanding the above considerations, it is considered that due to the close proximity and its overall height and bulk, the proposed two storey side extension would have an overbearing impact and lead to a significant loss of light to the neighbour at no.46. This will unacceptably impact on living conditions at this neighbour. The scheme is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy HE2 not being compatible with or improving its surroundings in its relationship to nearby properties including minimising general disturbance to amenity.

### Flood Risk

61. 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.'
62. Both Policy ME6 and Paragraph 167 NPPF take a sequential approach to new development. This proposal is considered to be 'minor' development in flood risk terms and therefore the Sequential or Exception tests are not applicable to this proposal as set out in paragraph 174 of the NPPF.
63. The application property is located within future flood zone 3a. Therefore, had permission been recommended, this would have been subject to a condition for the floor levels of the extension to be the same as the existing dwelling and flood resistance and resilience measures shall be incorporated as appropriate in accordance with the Environment Agency's Standing Advice. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development is in accordance with policy ME6.

### Parking and Access

64. 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.
65. The extensions would result in an increase in the number of bedrooms from 2 to 4 within the dwelling. The site is within Zone B as set out in the Parking SPD and for a four-bedroom property the requirement is for two parking spaces and secure storage for 4 bicycles (1 per bedroom). The dwelling has a driveway and hardstanding to the front which provides ample room for 2 parking spaces. Furthermore, there is a storage area shown on the proposed ground floor plan where there is ample space to provide storage for 4 bicycles.
66. Therefore, it is considered the parking provision is acceptable and accords with Policy KS12.

### Other Matters

67. The application is for householder developer and as such is exempt from the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement.

## **Planning Balance/Conclusion**

68. The proposed extensions to the existing dwelling at 44 Minterne Road are considered to be acceptable in principle. In this regard, Planning Permission has already been granted for a similar scheme to create 1st floor accommodation and erect a wraparound single storey flat roof rear and side extension. This current application seeks to create 1st floor accommodation resulting in a chalet bungalow of a similar contemporary design to the previously approved scheme and single storey flat roof rear extension. However, a two-storey side extension is now proposed which would primarily have a flat roof with a small, hipped roof element nearest to the boundary with No.46. It is considered that the scale, mass, bulk and design of the proposed two storey extension would fail to respect the scale or character of the resultant enlarged dwelling and would not appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling and as such is contrary to policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset - Local Plan Part 1 (2014).
69. In addition, the proposed two storey flat roof side extension would be sited approximately 1.5m from the side elevation of no. 46 where there are windows serving habitable rooms. The increased height of 6.2m coupled with the depth and proximity of the extension to the neighbour would significantly reduce the levels of light entering these habitable rooms and would also have an overbearing impact on this neighbour. The proposal fails to be compatible with or improves its surroundings in its relationship to nearby properties including minimising general disturbance to amenity. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy adopted 2014 Policy H12 of the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan and the NPPF.
70. The applicants' agent states that the refusal of this application would be inconsistent with other decisions made on extensions to bungalows in the locality and has drawn attention to 6 examples. However, each proposal is judged on its own merits having regard to the specific characteristics of the site and its relationship to the surrounding area and neighbouring properties. An examination of these examples of Two Storey Side Extensions that the council have granted planning permission for are not comparable to the proposed two storey extension. The proposed two storey extension is located to the immediate south of the neighbour at No.46 and tight to the boundary with this neighbouring property which has windows serving habitable rooms on its side elevation.
71. The application already has a planning permission for a single storey extension which was considered to not result in significant overshadowing and loss of light. However, the addition of a first-floor extension would have this impact. Furthermore, the design of the two-storey extension with the large flat roof would appear as a visually intrusive, incongruous and overbearing form of development which is out of keeping with both the enlarged dwelling and the street scene.
72. The amended plans make a small change to the design however this does not result in any significant change in its external appearance nor the impact on the neighbouring property and therefore, does not address the concerns as outlined in the above assessment.
73. The proposal is therefore contrary to Christchurch Core Strategy and NPPF and the benefit of the development do not outweigh the harm identified above.

## **Recommendation**

Refuse, for the following reasons:

1. It is considered that the proposed two storey flat roof side extension, by reason of its scale, mass, bulk and design is not considered to respect the scale or character of the resultant enlarged dwelling and would not appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling. Overall, the scheme is a poor design which disregards the prevailing form, appearance and character of the host property and surrounding area. The scheme fails to be compatible with or improve its surroundings in its architectural style, scale, bulk and visual impact. As such the development is contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan, Part 1 Core Strategy 2014, saved Policy H12 of the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan 2001 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.
2. The proposed two storey flat roof side extension would be sited approximately 1.5m from the side elevation of no. 46 where there are windows serving habitable rooms. The proposed extension would measure 6.2m in height and would have a depth of 7m. This increase in height coupled with the depth and proximity to the neighbour would significantly reduce the levels of light entering these habitable rooms and would also have an overbearing impact on this neighbour. The proposal fails to be compatible with or improves its surroundings in its relationship to nearby properties including minimising general disturbance to amenity. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy adopted 2014 Policy H12 of the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan and the NPPF.

**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.

Reference to published works is not included