HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/70984

DESCRIPTION	Single storey side and rear extension
ADDRESS	77 Church Road Bishopstoke Eastleigh SO50 6DR

SITE VISIT DATE	25/06/2012
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Y
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Y

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above, to provide increased living accommodation and third bedroom.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site slopes down away from Church Road to the rear of the site.
TREES	There are a number of trees immediately adjacent to the site, the most important of which are a group of three now protected trees just within the garden of No.75 close to the boundary between the two properties and the proposed side extension.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mainly mature hedging/planting. To the rear boundary is a low fence onto the adjacent farm land.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	No.77 is a modest single storey former gate lodge at the entrance to Stoke Lodge and positioned close to Church Road. There is off-road parking for one car and a modest garden to the side and rear which opens onto countryside at the rear. The property has a small single storey rear extension.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site sits on the western edge of Bishopstoke within designated countryside with the immediate surrounding area having a semi-rural character.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/10/66898	Side extension to include first floor accommodation with front and rear dormers	20/05/2010 Ref
5614/1	Alterations.	Approved 1974
5614	Alterations.	Approved 1958

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
138 Church Rd	The proposed extensions will come too close to trees which are the

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	subject of a TPO. An increase to the size of this property will create additional on-road parking in a section of Church Road which is already clogged by parked cars associated with the car repair business next door. Building work has been taking place continuously for the past five years at the adjacent property. The further two extensions to this property will create yet more intrusive noise and disruption to the neighbourhood.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BST	objection – detrimental to the building's character and an adverse impact on the building's historic importance
CRT	I currently object to the above application on grounds of insufficient information submitted with the application. Currently they have only submitted a tree survey but not an arboricultural impact and method statement which would provide the necessary detailed methodology as to how the adjacent trees will be afforded protection during the build process. 05/06 – (verbal discussion) – AIA received and addresses some of the questions, sufficient to confirm work can potentially take place without harming trees. Will need to condition submission of Method Statement and compliance with, together with pre-commencement site meeting.
ENV	Thank you for consulting this Service on the above application. I have reviewed the information provided / that held by this Service and I would like to make the following comments: .. The development site is located adjacent to a former licensed landfill site (Breach Farm; reference number 9/16), which is shown on the historical aerial photography that this Service holds and old planning records .. The proposed development includes the reworking of the internal structure, requiring the relocation of services that are usually located within the floor structure. As the proposed development has the potential to be effected by gases / vapours from the former landfill site, I recommend that the following condition is imposed: "No development shall take place until the applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the risks, to or arising from, the proposed development, and a report of this assessment, including recommendations for protection of the development, has been received and approved in writing by the LPA. [British Standard BS10175:2011 'Investigation of potentially contaminated sites – Code of Practice' is a useful source of advice on site investigation] Any recommendations for protection of the development, the remediation scheme, must be supervised by a competent person and a completion certificate provided by that person to the LPA to certify that the works have been

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	implemented in accordance with that scheme." The applicant should be advised that in advance of the commencement of development the condition requires that the assessment be completed and approved. Also that as a result of the assessment, amendments to the design of building structures may be required, further that adequate provision of time needs to be made so the assessment can be completed before works commence on site. The applicant should also be advised to contact Environmental Health to discuss the options open to them in order to comply with the above condition. Further information and advice about developing 'Brownfield Land' can be found on the Council's website. The relevant web-page is entitled 'Development of Brownfield Land'.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Outside Built-up Area Boundary Within Local Gap Identified as a Building of Local Importance On edge of an Established Residential Area Adjacent to a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 3.CO, 9.CO, 59.BE & 175.LB
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

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 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

The application site lies just outside the urban edge and within designated countryside and the Eastleigh/Bishopstoke Local Gap where saved Policies 1.CO and 3.CO of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011) apply.

Saved Policy 1.CO outlines the types of development considered appropriate for countryside locations, which include development necessary for agricultural, forestry or horticultural purposes, outdoor recreational uses, public utility services, extensions to education or health facilities, and that any development meets the other criteria of the plan.

Saved Policy 3.CO of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) relates to local gaps and states that planning permission will only be granted for appropriate development which cannot be acceptably located elsewhere and which would not physically or visually diminish a local gap.

While the general presumption is against development in the countryside unless for agricultural purposes, saved Policy 9.CO does allow the extension of existing residential properties within countryside locations to be extended provided the dwelling is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition, it would not allow the sub-division of the dwelling, it is appropriate for the dwelling and its plot, and would not materially worsen the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings or the countryside in general.

Also of relevance in this instance is saved Policy 175.LB which related to ‘Buildings of Local Importance’. This policy states that “Development which would have a detrimental impact on a building of local importance or its setting will not be permitted.”

Therefore in pure planning policy terms, the basic principle of extending the existing property is acceptable, provided that proposed is considered to be appropriate to the building and its countryside and local gap setting.

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.

No.77 was built in the 19th Century as the gate lodge to Stoke Lodge, which is now a Grade II

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Listed Building. While the gate lodge is not nationally listed, it is classified as a Building of Local Importance and is therefore protected by saved Policy 175.LB of the local plan. It is also noted within 'Hampshire Treasures' as a building of note.

The gate lodge was originally a small four room cottage with a thatched roof which has now been replaced by concrete tiles. The dwelling has had a modest extension to the rear, presumably built in the 1950s or 70s but which did not follow through the unusual window design of the original gate lodge. Overall, the current building is an attractive property of significant local interest.

The current proposal has come about as a result of an earlier application to increase the footprint and provide first floor accommodation which was refused. The applicant had looked to carry out the proposed extensions under permitted development, however in order for this to be done, the ridge height would have to be below 4m. This would have a detrimental impact on the character of the property. The design of the extensions has been amended to match the ridge height to the existing ridge, creating a simpler roofline which is more in keeping with the style of the property.

Also of benefit to the property is the removal of the concrete tiles and their replacement with plain clay tiles.

The proposed design of the extension is reflective of the existing property, with the windows and doors in keeping with the existing and the slope of the roof the same as the main roof.

Whilst the proposed extensions do increase the footprint of the dwelling by 57%, these extensions could be built under permitted development with an amended, and more harmful, roofline as discussed above.

The proposed extensions will not result in loss of light, outlook or cause overlooking to neighbouring properties as a result of its relationship to no.75, and the level of screening around the site.

The existing parking area to the dwelling will not be affected by the extension and will not significantly reduce the rear private amenity space.

The site is within the root protection zone of several protected trees. A tree survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment have been provided which identify trees that could potentially be affected by these works. The AIA goes into some discussion which demonstrates the extensions could be carried out without harming the protected trees, however a method statement needs to be provided indicating exactly how this will take place. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has agreed that conditions can be imposed regarding the submission of this information.

Given the age of the property and the limited disturbance to the ground as a result of foundation design required due to the proximity to protected trees, it is not considered appropriate to impose the conditions requested by the Council's Environmental Health unit. However an informative can be included to inform the applicant.

Given an objection received from the local resident with regard to noise and disturbance in the vicinity, a condition can be imposed restricting the hours of operation to limit the impact on residential amenity during the build out.

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 permission subject to condition.