HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/72091

DESCRIPTION	Single storey rear extension, addition of rear dormer & insertion of 2no. front roof lights
ADDRESS	5 Holmesland Drive Botley Southampton SO30 2SH

SITE VISIT DATE	26/03/13
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposed extension would project 3.8m extending across the rear of the property to 3.3m in height. The proposed dormer would measure 4.7m by 2.4m (h) by 4.4m. The proposed roof lights would be sited on the front roof slope.
TOPOGRAPHY	The rear garden steps up in land level by approx. 1m towards the rear boundary.
TREES	There are no trees to be affected by the development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	A mix of close boarded fencing and low level brick wall.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi detached two storey property with a front/side driveway leading up to a single garage, small rear garden set on two tiers and a detached shed set in the rear corner of the plot.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential, characterised by semi detached properties and small rows of terraces.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/13/72092	Two storey side extension with integral carport & single storey rear extension	Under consideration

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Botley Parish Council	The dormer windows will overlook neighbouring properties in close proximity. Members questioned the impact of the roof lights on the street scene. A condition is requested to remove permited development

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	rights to prevent further development of the site.

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
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – Area 47:

- Retain the wide grass verges and semi mature tree planting
- Maintain open green space east of Holmesland Drive
- Maintain the predominant plot widths
- Maintain the predominant open frontages while seeking to maintain a clear distinction between public and private space

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance 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

x	None received		See below		
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

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. The guidance is largely reiterated in Policy DM1.

The size and design of the dormer window is not considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality. The dormer window would cover the entire roof slope of the property and for this reason would unduly dominate the existing property. At almost the full depth and height of the roof, the resultant property will appear three storey and out of keeping with the existing semi-detached host properties and neighbouring dwellings within this locality . A smaller dormer, set back from the sides and edge eaves of the property would be more sympathetic to the semi-detached property. of the resulting in a visually prominent and intrusive feature.

The proposed roof lights for reasons of their size and design are not considered to result in prominent features that would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area.

The proposed rear extension although unusual in its design is not considered to result in an unsympathetic or visually intrusive addition to the rear of the property. There would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties from the rear extension by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking due to its size, siting and design. The rear extension would project approx. 1.3m past the neighbour's conservatory and would be higher. A light test demonstrates that there would not be an unacceptable impact to light reaching this neighbour (number 7) and consideration has also been given to the orientation of buildings.

The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

The development conflicts with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission 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.

CONCLUSION

Recommend refusal.