HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/70177

DESCRIPTION	Single storey side & rear extension for indoor swimming pool & gym complex with link to main dwelling
ADDRESS	Ashberry House Winchester Road Botley Southampton SO32 2BX

SITE VISIT DATE	13/1/12
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Extension has a pitched roof with glassed area opening onto garden. It measures approximately 9m(w) by 25.3m(d) by 4.1m(h) with a link attached to the house.
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat
TREES	some small trees
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	High hedging and fencing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached house set in a very large plot.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site lies in the countryside between Fair Oak and Botley, north of Hedge End, part of a loose-knit scatter of dwellings in this rural location.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/28480/00	Erection of replacement dwelling Condition 4 states that dwellings gross floor space must not be more than 150square metres (excluding garage).	Permit 1985
Z/28480/001	Erection of detached house and double garage (following demolition of existing house)	Permit 1986
Z/32623/000	Two storey and single storey extensions (not built and now expired)	Permit 1992
Z/32623/002	Construction of single storey extension (built)	Permit 1998
F/11/69413	Single storey side and rear extension for swimming pool, gym and changing area with single storey link to main house.	Permit 2011
U/11/69414	Application for a lawful development certificate for a proposed use: Single storey side & rear extension for swimming pool, gym & changing area with single storey link to main house	Granted 2001

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/11/69415	First floor & two storey side extensions, replacement front porch & alterations to existing roof of garage & dwelling	Permit 2011

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Botley Parish Council	No response
Design Officer	No objection - Focusing purely on the appearance; an extension using the same roof pitches and materials is going to look much better than flatter ones to keep under the allowance limit. Also, now the main house is extended, the pool extension appears more in keeping.
Planning Policy (Comments made on orginal plans)	Objection The site lies in the countryside between Fair Oak and Botley, north of Hedge End, part of a loose-knit scatter of dwellings in this location. The proposal is for a large covered swimming pool and gym. The dwelling has recently been extended quite substantially (F/11/69415). The relevant policies are: 1.CO - seeks to restrict development in the countryside subject to other policies of the plan. This accords with current national planning policy as set out in PPS7 'Sustainable development in rural areas' para. 1(iv) which states that "New building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled." 9.CO - enables extensions to dwellings in the countryside subject to a number of criteria , of which the most relevant to this proposal are: (iii) - the extension does not result in the dwelling becoming disproportionate in size relative to neighbouring dwellings or its plot. (iv) - the design of the dwelling does not materially increase its impact on its surroundings or the countryside in general. In the emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, strategic policy S13 indicates that in the countryside, the Borough Council will seek to retain rural character and avoid urbanisation, and policy DM14 effectively repeats existing policy 9.CO. The proposed swimming pool and gym extension is a very substantial structure which more than doubles the footprint of the existing dwelling. This is considered disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling and to the size of others in the vicinity. While it is screened from view by an existing hedge, this is not considered a sufficient safeguard to limit potential long-term impact on the countryside, or the danger of cumulative urbanising impact in countryside areas should other similar

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	proposals be received. A policy objection is raised on this basis.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Outside the Urban Edge - Countryside

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 1.CO, 9.CO & 59.BE
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not Within Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPG	-	1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS	-	7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

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		
Comments are noted				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See below		
Other …					

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

Policy 9.CO of the Local Plan requires extension to existing dwellings in the countryside to meet the following criteria:

(i) The dwelling is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition
(ii) The development is not likely to facilitate the subdivision into more than one dwelling.
(iii) The extension does not result in the dwelling becoming disproportionate in size relative to neighbouring dwellings or its plot.
(iv) The design of the dwelling does not materially increase its impact on its surroundings or the countryside in general.

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.

ASSESSMENT

The application is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme. The original scheme was refused primarily due to the size of the extension and its detrimental impact on the house and countryside locality. Since the first submission, the property has been granted a lawful development certificate for a detached swimming pool building. The proposal covers a similar footprint to the lawful building and at 4.1m is only marginally over that allowable under permitted development. The main differences between the schemes are the design, its shift towards the house and the introduction of a single storey link.

The design and materials used in the proposal match that of the house. The use of ridge tiles will help disguise the section of flat roof while keeping the buildings height and bulk to a minimum. The proposal also has the advantage of bringing the building closer to the house and with the link will appear as one combined building rather than two individual properties. The link itself is relatively small and unobtrusive. Although I remain uncomfortable with the size of the building, it is an improvement upon what can be completed under permitted development.

I acknowledge the comments of The Design Officer, in that the now extended house is a better proportion to the proposed building, which itself sits in a very large plot. I also note that houses and outbuildings in the locality tend to be fairly large, although they do not appear to be quite on this scale. Concern has been raised by the Policy Officer about the buildings size and its urbanizing impact on the area of countryside. However, the site is surrounded by a high hedge that helps to screen the building from view and I am comfortable this could be retained through a planning condition.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The house is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition and the nature of the building is unlikely to lead to a subdivision of the property. Again this issue can be resolved through a planning condition. The site has no close neighbours whose residents would be affected by the development, by way of overlooking, loss of light or loss of outlook. The property is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

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 legislative background.

CONCLUSION

Permit