REF. NO. F/12/71033

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Two storey rear extension, raising of ridge height and roof alterations to provide first floor accommodation with deck. 8 Common Close, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 1HF.

SITE VISIT DATE – 23/07/2012

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above to provide additional living accommodation consisting of 4/5 bedrooms, together with bathrooms and a family area on the ground floor, with the main living space and kitchen at first floor to make use of views towards the rear garden which is at a higher level.
SITE AREA	Approx 770 sqm
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	The general topography in the area slopes gently down from north to south. However, the rear garden of the application property has been landscaped by a previous owner to form a large flat area. This means that the main garden is almost two metres higher than the floor level of the existing bungalow.
TREES	There are a number of trees along the rear boundary of the site, a large Oak in particular which are subject to preservation orders but none will be affected by the proposed works.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open to the front with 1.5 – 1.8 metre hedges to the side boundaries. The rear garden boundaries are marked by an earth bank with planting on top to form a hedge.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Modest 2/3 bedroom detached 1950s bungalow at the end of a close of similar but not identical bungalows. Parking to the front and side with a good size garden to the rear at a higher level. There is a recent single storey extension to the rear built under permitted development.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and made up of mainly detached bungalows and chalet bungalows on reasonable size plots, most of a similar age to the application property.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
4385	Garage.	Approved 1954
3930A	Bungalow.	Approved 1954

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
4 Common Close	No objection. Support the proposal and it is nice to see a young family back in the close.
11 Common Close	No objections.
6 Common Close	No objection. Support the proposal. Would make a better use of the space and be of benefit to the applicants.
5 Common Gardens	Object. Concerns of overlooking and loss of privacy, overdevelopment, out of keeping with the close and a single storey extension was only recently completed.
7 Common Close	No objection. Support the proposal.
41 Linden Grove	Concerns regarding the proximity of the Oak tree, as well as disturbance during building works.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Environmental Health	No objection but conditions regarding potential ground contamination, as well as amenity protection conditions are recommended.
Chandler's Ford Parish Council	No objection.

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 Document : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document : Residential Parking Standards

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

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 the principle of that proposed, its layout and design, impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, protected trees, parking and impact upon the general character

POLICY COMMENTARY

of the surrounding area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Comments noted. However, the suggested condition requiring a full land contamination survey is considered to be rather onerous on what is a relatively small scale domestic development. This is really something that is best covered by Building Regulations, although a note to applicant will be added to the decision notice to make them aware of the issue.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Comments are noted and responded to where appropriate below.

With regards to the single storey extension which was quite recently built under permitted development, this was constructed by a previous owner of the property and does not necessarily preclude further extensions and additions to the property.

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."

The proposal is considered to comply 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, 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.

Layout & Design – The application proposes a side/rear extension at ground floor level, as well as new first floor accommodation within the resulting and raised roof space which will be 0.6 metres higher than the existing ridge line. The design is slightly unusual in that it will form an 'up side down' house with bedrooms at ground floor level and the main living accommodation at first floor. This is mainly due to the desire of the applicants to make more use and gain better views of their rear garden, which presently they do not have from the property due to its substantially higher level. These alteration would make the existing modest

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

2/3 bedroom bungalow into a 4/5 bedroom family dwelling, albeit with quite modest and potentially constrained main living accommodation due to it being within the roof space.

In terms of its appearance, from the street it will retain its single storey appearance and character, the only hint of it having any first floor accommodation being a number of roof light windows to the side elevations. While the side extension is fairly wide, this will be well set back from the road and generally shielded by the neighbouring property and in terms of its footprint is no larger than the extensions to No.5 on the opposite side of the close. The enlarged roof would be higher than the two neighbouring bungalows to either side but each bungalow is very slightly different to its neighbour and its position within the close means that this modest increase in height of 0.6 metres will not be obvious when viewing the close as a whole. No.2 already has a higher ridgeline than any other property in the close and was built like this back in the 1950s so that some first floor accommodation could be provided.

Overall, while seeming to be quite substantial in terms of the amount of additional accommodation being provided in comparison to the original bungalow, that proposed is considered to be acceptable in design terms and to accord with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the local plan and the relevant sections of the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Residential Amenity – Concerns have been raised by the occupiers of No.5 Common Gardens that the area of decking to the rear and the new first floor windows will result in overlooking and loss of privacy. The distance between these new rear windows and the deck area to the application site's rear boundary at its closest point is 20 metres, with a further 8.0 metres to the main rear elevation of No.5. This distance alone would be sufficient to provide adequate privacy to No.5, as will the existing boundary screening, together with the fact that the level changes across the application site would effectively mean that the new first floor would be at approximately the same floor as No.5. It would therefore be hard to substantiate a reason for refusal on the grounds of overlooking or loss of privacy. As to the deck area, while the proposals do not show any side screens, the orientation of the application dwelling in relation to its immediate neighbours means that no unacceptable overlooking of these properties would occur.

As to other amenity issues such as loss of light or outlook, again due to the orientation and proximity of the application dwelling in relation to its neighbours, these will not be a problem.

With regards to the issues of disturbance during construction which have been raised, a condition can be applied restricting working hours and days. This should help preserve and protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Trees – As has been mentioned above the site has a large Oak to the rear which is subject to a preservation order, although the proximity of this tree to the dwelling is such that it will be unaffected by the proposed building works. However, a condition is recommended to ensure that no burning takes place on the site, in order to help protect the tree and ensure neighbour's amenity id protected during the building works.

Parking – With the increase from 2/3 bedrooms to 4/5, it needs to be demonstrated that there is sufficient room to accommodate three off-road parking spaces on site in order to comply with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Parking Standards'. The site plan submitted with the application shows that three spaces can be provided and a condition requiring these spaces to be retained is recommended.

Street Scene & Area Character – A further concern of the one objector to the application is that a two storey dwelling is out of keeping with Common Close. While this concern is noted, this would not be the first two storey property in the close, No.2 having had a first floor from

REF. NO. F/12/71033

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

when it was built in the 1950s. This on its own is not sufficient to refuse the application, the main question being will the proposal fit successfully into the close and respect its existing character? It is felt that the scheme submitted does this very successfully and is far more sympathetic in terms of maintaining the character and appearance of the close than many other examples in the surrounding area, including Linden Grove. The property will maintain its single storey character, the same roof form and materials as the present bungalow and its neighbours and as such is considered to comply with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the local plan and the relevant sections of the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

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.

CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons given above, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.