HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/11/69713

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension with additional accommodation in roof space
ADDRESS	1 St Austell Close Bishopstoke Eastleigh SO50 6GQ

SITE VISIT DATE	Application site inspected 18th November 2011
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	The submitted drawings allow a comprehensive assessment of the development proposed.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	In accordance with the Local Planning Authority's publicity of planning proposals all relevant neighbours have been consulted.

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	This application proposes the construction of a two storey addition that projects 5.4 metres from the flank wall of the host dwelling, with a similar depth but includes a minor recess of approximately 0.5 metres from the front elevation and similar height of the roof ridge.
TOPOGRAPHY	St Austell Close climbs steeply up hill from its junction with Truro Rise in an easterly direction. It should be noted the rear garden of number 11 Truro Rise is approximately 2 metres lower that the existing side amenity area of the application site.
TREES	There are no trees in the vicinity of the application site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The frontage to the application site addressing St Austell Close is open with a 1.7 metre high close board fence forming the common boundary with number 13 Truro Rise.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Modest semi-detached dwelling at an angle to the highway, with a variety of external finishes namely facing brick, render and breeze block with a concrete tiled roof.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	St Austell Close is in a small cul-de-sac housing estate, with a variety of modest two-storey semi-detached houses on small plots, in an elevated position on the outskirts of Bishopstoke.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
O/06/56293	Outline: Erection of 1 no. 2 bed dwelling. Land adjacent to 1 St Austell Close, Bishopstoke.	Refused 18th April2006 Appeal Dismissed 15th December 2006

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	No third party correspondence generated by this planning proposal.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BIshopstoke Parish Council	No consultation response
Head of Housing & Environmental Health	Application site located within 25 metres of a former sand pit and refuse tip. As the proposal has the potential to be effected by gases/vapours from the former landfill site, recommend the imposition of a condition covering the matter of potentially contaminated sites. Additionally, conditions should be imposed for reasons of amenity protection covering hours of work and no on site burning during the complete construction period.

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) Saved Policy 59.BE
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area – BIFOHH 9

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Application site not located within a Special Policy Area

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPS 1	-	Delivering Sustainable Development

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

None received		See below	X	
Other – If Officers are minded to recommend approval the conditions suggested by the Head of Housing and Environmental Health would be considered.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received	X	See below		
Other – The application did not generate any third party correspondence.					

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

The nature of this application does not warrant contributions to offset the impact of the development proposed on the local infrastructure.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

PROPOSAL

This application proposes the construction of a two storey addition that projects 5.4 metres from the flank wall of the host dwelling, with a similar depth but includes a minor recess of approximately 0.5 metres from the front elevation and similar height of the roof ridge. The width of the current property equates to 5.7 metres.

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

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, and loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

Whilst the overall appearance of the proposed development takes account of the host property, it should be noted that in terms of size this extension will dominate the original dwelling. Normally, domestic extensions are designed to be a subservient element respecting the scale and size of the main house to provide additional accommodation. In this instance magnitude of extension will undermine the architectural integrity of the host dwelling thereby introducing a feature of unwelcome prominence to the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Officers fully acknowledge that the applicant's representative has taken a lead from the host dwelling in terms of architectural style, detailing and further takes advantage of the mix of facing materials. However, in physical terms the proposed side addition represents nearly a doubling in size of the existing property. The slight recess of the front elevation, complimentary materials and detailing of the extension does not allow the addition to integrate within the wider street-scene. It should be noted the footprint and scale of the proposed dwelling dismissed in December 2006, is very similar to this proposal. The appointed Inspector forwarding the following findings:

"Many houses in St Austell Close are set at an angle to the road. This helps to maintain a sense of spaciousness and privacy in an otherwise crowded environment. The angled pair of houses would be extended so the front of the proposed house would be very close to the road. This congestion would harm the street scene."

The proposed two storey side addition virtually covers the whole width of the plot. The

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

consequence of the scale of the development is to erode away the open views when looking southwards. This being detrimental to the wider spatial characteristics of the street scene.

Accordingly the scheme breaches the provisions of saved Policy 59.BE aimed at ensuring all new development is in sympathy and respect its host environment.

In the determination of this proposal consideration has to be give to the significant levels in height between the application site and properties to the west. In particular a section of the rear amenity area of number 11 Truro Road runs alongside the flank wall of the proposed extension. In view of the considerable lower level of the garden area, the proposed side elevation will be detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers by reason of the excessive building bulk and overbearing nature.

The development does not comply with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE aimed at ensuring new development does not conflict with adjoining land users.

It should be noted the matters raised in the Character Area Appraisals Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Supplementary Planning Document are not relevant in this particular determination. On the basis the “Guidance” contained within Character Area BIFOHH 9 are not undermined.

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

For the reasons outlined in this report the recommendation is to refuse the application.