HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/71868

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side & rear extension
ADDRESS	35 Station Road Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5AE

SITE VISIT DATE	01/02/2013
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Application seeks permission to extend the property at two storey level to the side and rear, largely over the existing ground floor footprint, replacing the existing conservatory. The extension will provide a large family room at ground floor level with a bedroom and ensuite shower room at first floor level, resulting in a total of four bedrooms. This is an amended design to a previously refused proposal.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level site.
TREES	None to be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open boundary shared with No37 between the two properties with a 1.8m fence along the remaining boundary. Open to front.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached property, forming one of two matching pairs. Driveway extends up side of property, mirroring that of No37 with additional parking available in the gravelled front garden. Property has previously been extended to the side and rear at single storey level.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area comprising pairs of semi-detached properties.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/12/71433	Two storey side & rear extension	Refused Oct 2012

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Concerns received from one neighbour regarding the impact on light levels currently enjoyed. Concern also raised regarding introduction of two storey extension to the side which is deemed to be out of character.	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hound Parish Council	No objection
Engineering & Transportation	No objection subject to retention of existing parking

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

See below

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

See below

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

History

The applicant entered into a pre-application enquiry (Q/11/69953) for a two storey side and rear extension but no elevations were submitted as part of this. The applicant originally proposed a flat roof but was advised to explore other more attractive and appropriate designs solutions. He was invited to submit further amended plans prior to a formal application being submitted but none were received. The first application was refused on design grounds, with the roof not considered to be sympathetic to the original dwelling.

Assessment

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan outlines a number of criteria against which the development proposals will be assessed, stating that development must,

“take full and proper account of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and are appropriate in mass, scale, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings…….”

and

“avoid unduly interfering, disturbing or conflicting uses, especially in terms of….overlooking, loss of daylight, loss of outlook…”

Policy DM1 of the Pre-submission Local Plan shares the thrust of Policy 59.BE, adding that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance: residential amenities and the character and appearance of urban areas.

Also of relevance is the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design, “is indivisible from good planning” (para56) and that “permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area” (para64).

The proposal is considered to conflict with policy 59.BE and the guidance contained within the NPPF.

Principle

The site sits within the urban edge and as such, the principle of a domestic extension is acceptable provided it complies with the relevant policies within the local plan, 59.BE in this instance.

Impact on character and appearance

The property is one half of a pair, with another very similar pair sitting adjacent. A few of these properties have been extended to the rear and side at single storey level. The extension will occupy a footprint similar to that of the existing conservatory and rear extension with it just projecting forward up the side of the property approx. 1m. The two storey element has been

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

staggered in order to reduce any impact on the neighbouring to the south west (no33).

The roof design has been amended since the previously refused application and now sits more comfortably with the original dwelling. The extension, whilst fairly large, does appear as subservient to the property.

Whilst there may be no examples of two storey side extensions within the immediate locality, there is no real pattern or uniformity to the street scene. Due to the double width driveway between the application site and No37, the extension is not considered to adversely affect the spacing around the building or rhythm of the street.

Impact on residential amenity

Due to the scale, design and siting in relation to adjacent properties the proposal is not considered to result in material harm to the amenities of neighbours. It will undoubtedly be very visible when viewed from the dining area of No37 (window faces the existing flank wall of No35) and it will also encroach into some of the sky views currently enjoyed. As the extension will only be visible when looking out at a particular direction from a particular point within the extension, it cannot be argued that unacceptable harm will result in terms of creating an overbearing impact. It is likely to have an impact on some of the direct sunlight currently enjoyed in No37's dining area towards the latter part of the day but again, it cannot be demonstrated that this causes material harm to the amenities in terms of light impact. For most of the day the extension will have no impact on light levels within No37 due to the orientation of the two properties. The dining area is also part of the large kitchen/family room served by folding doors across the rear elevation.

The proposal complies with the light tests in respect of the adjoining neighbour, No33 and due to the scale of the extension proposed and its position in relation to the windows belonging to No33, there will be no adverse impact on terms of it visually intrusive or overbearing.

Highway Impact

The resulting four-bed property is required to provide 3 parking spaces within the curtilage ,in accordance with the Council's SPD: Residential Parking Standards. These can easily be accommodated and could be conditioned to be retained in the event of an approval. No objection on highway grounds.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSION

Recommendation is to approve for the reasons stated above.