HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/11/68483

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side & single storey rear extension with front porch
ADDRESS	15 Megan Road, West End, Southampton, SO30 3FQ

SITE VISIT DATE	14th April 2011
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Application seeks permission for two-storey side and single storey rear extension – amended scheme following refusal of F/09/64715. Extension would provide garage, kitchen and dining room at ground floor and 4th bedroom with ensuite bathroom/dressing room at first floor level. Plans also show a new porch to front elevation. Existing flat roof garage and rear conservatory would be demolished to allow for extension.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level site
TREES	n/a
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open front boundary to street scene. 1.8m fencing to side and rear boundaries.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	End of terrace property, unusual cropped gable feature to front elevation which is mirrored on No 21 at the other end of the terrace. Flat roof detached garage adjacent to house.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Established residential area – mix of two storey and bungalow properties.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/09/64715	Two storey and single storey side extensions and front porch following demolition of existing garage and conservatory	Refused – April 2009
21 Megan Road – Z/40104/000	Construction of two-storey side and single storey front extension	Permit – August 2003

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
13b Megan Road	I wish to object on the following grounds:

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	The proposed extension would appear overbearing and intrusive, as viewed from my adjacent property (No 13b) and would cause additional loss of outlook and light to my property. This application is substantively the same as a similar application in 2009, (F/09/64715). That previous application was refused as failing to meet the amenity requirements set out in Policy 59.BE(vii) of the adopted EBLPR and in the Residential Amenity SPG. The case officer at the time was Ruth Harding. I enclose two photos taken from inside my living room window which faces No 15. These corroborate the above statement. The proposed extension would result in an unduly cramped development and would erode the gap between the two properties, to the detriment of the appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposals fail to meet the design criteria set out in Policy 59.BE(i) of the adopted EBLPR. I enclose a copy of the refusal document, printed in 2009, which contains the detailed reasons behind that refusal and from which I have quoted above. One photo shows the rear of No 15, facing north, and the other shows the facing gable wall and front, facing south-east. Mr Kelly has been aware of my objections, both in 2009 and now in 2011. It would appear that he did not understand the content of the first refusal.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	Object: The size, siting and design would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site that is not in sympathy with the prevailing character of the surrounding properties.
Environment Agency	We have assessed this proposal as having low environmental risks and therefore, have no objections to the proposals as submitted. Due to resources, we will not be providing full comments on this application.
BAA	The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria. We have no objection to this proposal. We would, however, make the following observation: Cranes – given the nature of the proposed development, it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. We would therefore draw the applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4, 'Cranes and Other Construction Issues', available at www.aoa.org.uk/publications/safeguarding.asp
Head of Environmental Health	No objection – recommend conditions re hours of work and burning.

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
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh
Supplementary Planning Guidance:Storage and Collection of Domestic Waste & Recyclable Materials
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Biodiversity

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – HEWEB 17

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPS1	-	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, trees, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	X	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	X	
Other …					

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

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

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, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

The proposed extension measures approximately 3.3m in width, compared to the 3.9m proposed under the refused application. At ground floor, the extension would measure approx 9.5m in depth, extending the full depth of the house and projecting 1.5m beyond the existing rear elevation. The first floor element measures 7.7m in depth, being set back approx 0.7m from the front elevation of the existing house.

The proposals are an improvement in terms of the scale and bulk of the extension when compared to the previously refused scheme – there would be distance of approximately 5.6m between the side elevation of the extension and the side of No 13b, compared to approx 4.5m in the previous application. The height and bulk of the roof has also been reduced, with the ridge height of the extension now being below that of the main house.

With regards to No 13b, this property has a side facing lounge window looking out towards the side elevation of No 15 – this window also looks out towards the existing flat roof garage to No 13b. The previous application was refused due to the impact on this window in terms of loss of light and outlook. However, with the amendments to the design, the proposed extensions now just comply with the 25 deg test outlined in the Council's Residential Amenity SPG – the outlook from the window will alter, with the side elevation of No 15 being closer, but there would still be a view past the front and rear elevations of the extension.

In addition, whilst the side window is the only window serving the lounge to No 13b, it is not the only source of natural light – the room has glazed French doors leading to a conservatory at the rear of the house, which provides additional natural light to the room.

While the overall scale and form of the extension is considered acceptable in terms of the relationship to the existing property, I am concerned that the proposed design appears somewhat contrived and awkward with the two small first floor windows and the gable sections of roof above them – this pattern of fenestration bears no relation to the form or pattern of windows in the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

existing property and I am concerned that this would result in a visually intrusive built form within the street scene.

Amended plans with a single first floor window the front and rear of the extension have been received, (dated 20th May 2011), resulting in a simpler and more sympathetic design in relation to the existing property. The design is therefore considered acceptable.

The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot. The single storey extension to the rear is not considered to result in any adverse impact to the adjoining property.

The amended plans also show the required 3 off road parking spaces to serve the resulting 4-bed property. Engineers have confirmed these details are now acceptable, although have noted that the details re the dropped kerb are missing from the plans. A condition is therefore recommended requiring details of the dropped kerns to be submitted prior to commencement of development.

Overall, the proposals are considered to comply with the guidance contained within Policy 59.BE of the adopted local plan.

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

Recommend approval.