REF. NO. F/13/73278

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Two storey front and side extension. 219 Passfield Avenue, Eastleigh, SO50 9NE

SITE VISIT DATE – 31/10/2013

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above to provide an additional sitting room and WC at ground floor level, a larger existing and an additional bedroom (four in total) at first floor level and a loft room.
SITE AREA	193 sqm
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	Generally flat and level.
TREES	None on or adjacent to the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front is marked by a tall hedge, with the remaining side and rear boundaries having 1.8 metre timber fences.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	1930s/40s two storey ex-council end of terrace dwelling on a triangular corner plot close to the junction between Locksley Road and Passfield Avenue. There is a small area of garden and parking for two vehicles to the front and a small side/rear private garden. The property has a small single storey extension to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is residential in nature with similar terraced housing to the east and the southern end of Fleming Park to the west on the opposite side of Passfield Avenue, making the site quite prominent in the public realm.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
2377	House.	Approved 1935

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received.	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
n/a	

REF. NO. F/13/73278

POLICY CONTEXT

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

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011): 59.BE
Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029: DM1, DM24
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Character Area Appraisals – Eastleigh (ELAC 19)
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."

It goes on to say in paragraph 64 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 and the way it functions."

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the principle of that proposed, its layout and design, impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, parking, as well as the street scene and character of the surrounding area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

n/a

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

n/a

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

n/a

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."

REF. NO. F/13/73278

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposal is considered to conflict with relevant Development Plan policies.

In this case policy issues for consideration include:

Principle – The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered appropriate and in accordance with the relevant local plan policies and supplementary guidance. The most relevant policy in this case is saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan which 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, cyclists and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, and noise and fumes. Also of relevance is Policy DM1 of the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Layout & Design – The scheme proposes to provide a large new two storey gabled extension to the front and side of the dwelling. It would sit 2.0 metres further forward of the existing front gable, 3.3 metres out from the side flank wall, and be 7.3 metres deep. This plus the loft room would double the existing floor area of what is a relatively modest end of terrace dwelling. It would also result in a rather odd looking double gable front and a gabled flank wall.

While the principle of extending the present dwelling is acceptable, the size and scale of that proposed is in no way subservient or sympathetic to the present property. The existing front gable should remain the most prominent feature, but this would be hidden behind the proposed extension if it were built. It is not therefore considered to meet the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the current adopted local plan, Policy DM1 of the pre-submission plan or the guidance contained in the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document.

A further design and layout concern is how much of the currently small amenity space would be taken up by the proposed extension. The 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document states that houses must have a private external amenity space which is at least 60% of the total floor area of the dwelling which it serves. The present usable amenity area is approximately 67 square metres, with the floor area of the dwelling being approximately 70 square metres, thereby meeting the 60% requirement. The proposed resulting dwelling would have a total floor area (not including the loft room) of 128 square metres but a reduce amenity area of 47.5 square metres. This equates to an amenity space which is only 37% of the resulting floor area, well under the 60% minimum.

However, the 'Quality Places' SPD does allow less than this 60% minimum in urban areas and where a dwelling is within 100 metres of public open space. While Fleming Park is just over the road, it is felt that the very small scale and awkward shape of the remaining private external amenity space for the dwelling would be unattractive and unusable, as well as being completely out of character with the garden sizes of the surrounding residential properties. This being the case, it is felt that the proposal does not meet the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the current adopted local plan, Policy DM1 of the pre-submission plan or the guidance contained in the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document and will form a reason for refusal.

Residential Amenity – Despite the large size of the extension proposed, it is unlikely that there would be any adverse or unacceptable impact upon any neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook due to the orientation and relationship of the application dwelling to its immediate neighbours. However, the concerns of lack of usable amenity space

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

for occupiers of the application dwelling and the impact of this upon their residential amenity is still a concern.

Parking – The resulting dwelling would increase from three bedrooms to four, not including the proposed loft room which could be used as a fifth bedroom. The Council's 'Residential Parking Standards' Supplementary Planning Document requires four bedroom dwellings to provide a minimum of three off-road spaces on site. Presently two can be accommodated but much of this existing parking area would be used for the proposed extension. The submitted plans do show two spaces to the frontage of the site but these would be extremely tight and difficult to manoeuvre in and out of, as well as not providing the minimum number required.

This being the case, the proposal cannot meet the requirements of the 'Residential Parking Standards' Supplementary Planning Document or the relevant parts of saved Policy 59.BE of the current local plan or Policy DM24 of the pre-submission draft plan. This will therefore form a reason for refusal.

Street Scene & Area Character – In addition to the concerns that the proposed extension is not sufficiently subservient or sympathetic to the application dwelling, there are also strong concerns that the resulting development would have an adverse and unacceptable impact upon the street scene / public realm, as well as the character of the surrounding area. Not only does the application dwelling form an end to a symmetrical row of terraced dwellings, it also forms a part of a symmetrical arrangement of houses around the junction between Locksley Road and Passfield Avenue. This strong arrangement forms a 'gateway' feature into the street and fronting onto Fleming Park and is in a very prominent position. The proposed extension would not only unbalance the row of terraced houses but also the entrance and arrangement of dwellings at the junction, sitting forward of the existing frontage and being overly prominent, to the detriment of the street scene and strong formal layout of the surrounding area's character contrary to saved Policy 59.BE and Policy DM1 of the pre-submission plan, as well as the 'Quality Places' and 'Character Area Appraisals' Supplementary Planning Documents.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

While the principle of extending the application property is acceptable and the need/desire for additional living accommodation is acknowledged, it must be done in an acceptable and sympathetic manner and in accordance with the relevant planning policies and supplementary guidance. That proposed is not considered to meet these requirements and for the reasons set out above is recommended for refusal.