HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/70914

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side & rear extension
ADDRESS	34 Yardley Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 0HQ

SITE VISIT DATE	Various, including 13th and 15th February.
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Proposal follows a previous refusal for a two storey rear extension with side facing dormers. This scheme has no dormers and extends 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 to be provided on the first floor with side and rear facing roof light windows.
TOPOGRAPHY	Land gradually slopes down to the rear of the site. There is a step down from the internal floor levels to the raised patio and then again 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 of the properties in the locality have been significantly extended.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/11/70036	First floor & two storey rear extension with side dormer windows & roof lights	Refused 2012

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Mr Beale 36 Yardley Road	• Objection • Plans submitted are not accurate as they omit the shared chimney • The relocation of the kitchen could result in impact through kitchen waste drainage and ventilation provision • The first floor en-suite could result in impact through sanitary waste and sewer ventilation provision • Proposed rear first floor bedroom window will be intrusive • Proposed velux windows will be too close to existing chimney • The proposal could result in flooding

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	OBJECTION on the grounds of overdevelopment and insufficient planning information.

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 Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley 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

POLICY COMMENTARY

area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Comments noted. See assessment below.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
Other …Comments noted. Issue raised regarding the intrusiveness of the roof lights is discussed below. Amended plans received showing the chimney, with the position of the roof lights slightly amended to ensure they are clear of the chimney. The internal reconfigurations do not constitute development and could be undertaken at any time. Building Regs covers issues such as sanitation and ventilation. Whether the applicant *may* choose to install any ventilation at a point in the future is not material to the decision of this application. All guttering is within the applicant's land and the extension is being built on a hard paved raised patio. The drainage of rain water is therefore not considered to be materially worse than the existing situation.				

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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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.

This is an amended resubmission of a previously refused scheme. The previous scheme was refused on grounds of it resulting in an awkward and bulky form of development that is unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and that will adversely affect the amenities of the adjacent neighbour, No36 in terms of loss of light.

This amended scheme has removed the awkward side facing dormer windows and has stepped the extension away from the boundary shard with No36. The depth has 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.

The amended scheme is considered to comply with policy 59.BE for the following reasons:

- The size, siting and design of the extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality. It retains the character and overall roof design of the original property but extends it out further to the side, towards No32. This ensures the balance between the property and it's adjoining neighbour is maintained and will not appear as unduly prominent or awkward within the street scene. Many properties in this section of Yardley Road have already been significantly extended and so, whilst it is a sizeable extension, it will not be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
- In terms of residential amenity, the roof lights are all high level which will avoid any issues of overlooking/loss of privacy for the neighbours on both sides. This can be secured by a planning condition. The amended extension now complies with the light tests set out in the SPD:Quality Places and due to its reduced depth, it is also not felt to result in an overbearing or enclosing visual impact for the occupier of No36.
- The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.
- Adequate parking is still retained on the site, to the standards required in the Council's SPD:Residential Parking Standards.
- The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment and there is no objection on flood risk grounds.

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

The recommendation is to permit the proposal for the reasons stated above.