HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/71554

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side & rear extension with side facing dormer window (amended design to planning permission F/12/70914)
ADDRESS	34 Yardley Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 0HQ

SITE VISIT DATE	Various undertaken as part of previous applications
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. This application seeks approval for an amended design to a previously approved scheme, to include the provision of a side facing dormer window. The proposal is to extend at two storey level to the side and rear to provide an entrance hall to the front, wc, bathroom and larger lounge/diner (following internal reconfigurations) at ground floor level. Two bedrooms, one with en-suite and walk-n wardrobe to be provided on the first floor with side and rear facing roof light windows in addition to the side facing dormer.
TOPOGRAPHY	Land gradually slopes down to the rear of the site. There is a step down from the internal floor levels at the rear of the property/rear patio to the garden level. This is replicated for the adjacent property.
TREES	None to be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Largely open to front. 1.8m wall projects out approx 2m between the two attached properties. When the garden levels drop, a 1.8m fence then forms the remaining boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Modest semi-detached bungalow, forming a very uniform pair of bungalows sat within long plots. The property currently has a small rear conservatory, set away from the shared boundary, which is to be demolished and replaced as part of this proposal.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area comprising a mix of property styles and sizes. Many properties in the locality have been extended.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/12/70914	Two storey side & rear extension	Permitted 2012
F/11/70036	First floor & two storey rear extension with side dormer	Refused 2012

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	windows & roof lights	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	Objection on grounds of overdevelopment.

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 (2011-2059) DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area: 28

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

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 and flood risk.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Comments noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See below		

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

History

This is the third application for the property in the past 12 months. The first application, F/11/70036, proposed a first floor & two storey rear extension with side dormer windows & roof lights. This application was refused on grounds of impact on residential amenity and inappropriate design. The large rear extension, positioned close to the boundary, was considered to result in an overbearing and enclosing structure adversely affecting the amenities of no36. The design, due to the dormer windows and overall scale was considered to result in a bulky addition that unbalanced the pair of bungalows.

The agent entered into pre-application advice prior to submitting a new scheme and the next application was considered a significant improvement. The amended scheme removed the awkward side facing dormer windows and stepped the extension away from the boundary shared with No36. The depth was been significantly reduced with the extension extending to the side to give the applicant's the living accommodation they need without affecting the amenities of the neighbours. This scheme was approved.

During the pre-app discussions, the agent initially proposed the provision of one side facing dormer window *in addition* to the side extension. He was advised that this element gave rise to concern as it could result in a very bulky and unsympathetic addition to the property that would unbalance the pair of bungalows. Whilst it was removed as part of the formal submission, following the approval the applicants now wish to apply for the same scheme but with the inclusion of the side facing dormer.

As the scheme has planning approval already, this assessment will solely focus on the addition of the dormer window.

Principle

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

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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.

Character & appearance

The dormer window projects at 250mm below the height the ridge of the existing dwelling and extends just under the width of the approved side extension. It is, however, set back some 6.5m from the front of the dwelling and is fairly small in terms of its width (2.1m). This minimises the additional bulk that side facing dormers can sometimes give. The overall visual impact, whilst not ideal, is not considered to appear unacceptably unsympathetic or unbalance the pair of bungalows to such an extent to warrant a refusal of the application.

Residential Amenity

The issue of overlooking from the side facing dormer was carefully considered. The dormer will directly overlook the private garden are of the adjacent property to the south. No32 Yardley Road. It serves, however, an en-suite bathroom and it would be reasonable to impose a condition that the windows have only high-level openings and obscure glazing in the event of an approval. For this reason, overlooking/loss of privacy does not form a reason for refusal.

Highway impact

There is more than adequate space for parking within the curtilage for a dwelling with four bedrooms. No objection on highway grounds.

Flood risk

The agent has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and the proposal is not considered to increase flood risk. No objection on flood risk grounds.

On balance, the proposals are considered to comply with the guidance contained in Saved Policy 59.BE and Policy DM1.

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

CONCLUSION

Recommendation is to permit for the reasons stated above.