

Wednesday, 12 February 2025

Objection to Application APP/24/00891

Site Address: 86 Lovedean Lane, Waterlooville, PO8 9SS

Description: Rear single storey annex.

Introduction:

This objection letter relates to application APP/24/00891, which is a full planning application for the erection of a rear single storey annex at 86 Lovedean Lane, Waterlooville, PO8 9SS.

This objection has been submitted on behalf of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Relevant Planning Policy:

National Planning Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide (NDG)

Local Planning Policy:

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Discussion of Scheme:

Principle of Development/Annexe Tests:

The proposed annex is essentially a self-contained dwelling, equipped with all the attributes necessary for independent living, including a kitchen, living room, bathroom, toilet, office (potentially convertible to a bedroom), and its own pedestrian access and patio, entirely separate from the host dwelling. Crucially, no justification has been provided to explain the necessity of such a development, such as the intended occupants or their relationship to the main household.

In its current form, the annex appears fully capable of functioning as a separate residential unit. If either the existing dwelling or the annex were to be occupied independently, it would create a new dwelling and planning unit on the site. This concern is exacerbated by the lack of information about how the proposed structure would be functionally linked to the main house. There is no indication that the annex would share utilities or services with the primary dwelling, nor is there any explanation regarding practical matters such as bill payments, postal deliveries, or other operational integrations that would support its use as ancillary accommodation.

A genuine annex typically demonstrates a clear and ongoing functional relationship with the main dwelling. This often involves shared facilities, such as a kitchen or utility area, and an element of care or dependency between occupants. In this case, however, there are no shared facilities, and a separate patio and pedestrian entrance, making the annex especially conducive to independent occupation. Furthermore, the proposed annex is not subordinate in scale to the main house; its footprint of approximately 63 sqm is disproportionately large compared to the original dwelling's estimated 93 sqm. The scale alone undermines its claim to ancillary status and suggests an intention for separate habitation.

Case law, including *Uttlesford DC v SSE & White* (1992), confirms that even where facilities for independent living are present, whether a separate planning unit has been created depends on the facts and degree of each case. Here, the absence of shared facilities and the clear potential for independent occupation cast serious doubt on whether the proposal can genuinely be considered ancillary to the host dwelling. Without any specific information about the intended occupants of the annex or the nature of their reliance on the main household, the proposal fails to demonstrate how the site would continue to operate as a single planning unit.

Irrespective of the concerns over lack of linkage with the host dwelling, the size of the annexe would be such that there would be a significant increase in activity, noise and disturbance from the presence of two households. Given this, the annexe would dominate the rear garden and the surrounding area, substantially intensifying the use of the property and thereby changing the character and appearance of the area.

Overall, the proposal appears to be a thinly veiled attempt to create a new dwelling under the guise of an annex. Its scale, layout, and lack of functional integration with the main house strongly suggest that it could be independently occupied or even used for short-term rentals, such as through AirBnB. The application fails to adequately justify the development or provide any assurances that the annex would function as ancillary accommodation. As such, the proposal is tantamount to the creation of a new dwelling, contrary to the terms of the application.

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 CS16 states that planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work, and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through the loss of outlook and overlooking.

The new annexe would sit adjacent to the rear garden boundaries shared with a number of nearby properties, including Copper Cottage, and 1, 1a and 1b Frogmore Lane.

The annexe would be considerable in height, bulk and massing, measuring around 2.15m to the eaves, and around 3.56m to the ridge.

The size and close proximity of the annexe to the property boundaries would result in it enclosing the rear gardens unacceptably. Occupants of [REDACTED] would be particularly affected, as it would extend across almost the entire width of their rear garden boundary, leaving the outlook dominated by tall, blank, built form.

The bulk and massing proposed would also result in unacceptable impacts relating to overbearingness, and loss of light and overshadowing of rear garden areas; dwellings to the rear have relatively small gardens, and the presence of the building at the end boundaries would result in a significant loss of amenity, and render these gardens unpleasant places to relax.

Furthermore, the size of the annexe would be such that it could be occupied by a small family, with the consequential impact that there would be a significant intensification of the use of the property as a whole. Even if conditioned to be ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling, the size of the annexe would allow the presence of two households.

As such, the proposal fails to comply with policy CS16 or the relevant provisions of the NPPF, and as such, permission should be refused.

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 CS16 of the Havant Local Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work, and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and identifies and responds positively to existing features of local character within or close to the proposed development site.

This policy goes on to state that development should use the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors.

The Borough Design Guide SPD supplements Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy and aims to raise the standard of design across the borough; it sets out the council's design expectations with regard to new development and helps to identify and define the distinctive character and qualities of the borough that should be respectfully improved and enhanced through development.

The host dwelling is a traditionally styled dormer bungalow with several original features and traditional materials and proportions. In contrast the proposed annex would be modern and contemporary in design, proposed to be timber clad with large sections of glazing. It has no design

features that reflect the proportions and details of the host dwelling, and would have a poor visual relationship with the host dwelling. This lack of design cohesion would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the site and area.

Furthermore, as outlined above, the proposal is overly large and fails to appear as a modest and subservient structure, would result in the erosion of the open and verdant nature of the locality and would appear contrived and incongruent with the locality's prevailing character.

Furthermore, the buildings take up a significant amount of garden space, reducing the garden size considerably compared to other properties in the vicinity. As a result, the buildings result in the visual and spatial overdevelopment of the site, which is entirely at odds with the prevailing, open pattern of local development.

As such, the proposal fails to comply with Policy CS16, or the relevant advice contained within the The Borough Design Guide SPD, and fails to comply with the relevant provisions of the NPPF. As such, the application should be refused.

Conclusion

The proposed annex fails to meet the requirements for ancillary accommodation due to its scale, design, and lack of functional integration with the main dwelling. Its self-contained layout, including separate facilities and independent access, strongly indicates potential for independent occupation, contrary to the applicant's claims. The absence of shared utilities or operational linkages further supports this conclusion, with the annex resembling a separate dwelling unit rather than subordinate accommodation. Moreover, the size and proximity of the annex would significantly impact the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, resulting in overbearingness, overshadowing, and loss of outlook. Its modern design, lacking cohesion with the traditional host dwelling, would detract from the character and appearance of the area, conflicting with both local and national planning policies. Overall, the proposal represents an unsympathetic and unjustified development that fails to comply with policies regarding design, amenity, and appropriate use of land, warranting refusal of planning permission.