HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/11/70036

DESCRIPTION	First floor & two storey rear extension with side dormer windows & roof lights
ADDRESS	34 Yardley Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 0HQ

SITE VISIT DATE	Various, including 13th & 15th February
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes – amended plans were sought as original plans showed encroachment over the neighbour's land.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Proposal seeks to change the existing two bedroom bungalow into a four bedroom chalet style bungalow with the new master bedroom on the first floor having an ensuite bathroom and dressing room/walk-in wardrobe.
TOPOGRAPHY	Land gradually slopes down to the rear of the site. There is a step down from the internal floor levels at the rear of the property/rear patio 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.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
G Beale 36 Yardley Road	• Objection • Plans are inaccurate • Design & scale upsets the balance of symmetry of the pair of properties

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	• Plans show rear extension to encroach • Due to ground heave, proposal could result in damage to properties • Rear extension will result in overlooking/loss of privacy • Internal configuration does not comply with building regs. • Walk-in wardrobe may be converted into an additional bedroom in the future, requiring another dormer window

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town 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 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

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPG PPS	- -	 1 Delivering Sustainable Development

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, street scene and character of the area and flood risk.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Comments noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		

The plans did originally show the rear extension to overhang land not within the ownership of the applicant. Although legitimate in planning terms, the applicant's agent had signed Certificate A on the application form to state that there would be no encroachment. The applicant/agent were therefore requested to either amend the plans or withdraw the application and resubmit once notice had been served on the adjoining land owner, with Certificate B then signed. Amended plans were submitted to demonstrate no encroachment.

The compliance with building regs cannot be a material consideration – this will be looked at separately by Building Control Inspectors.

The current proposal is assessed without taking account what may be proposed in the future. Any future application for an additional dormer will be fully assessed against the relevant local plan policies.

The issues raised regarding the design and scale and the impact on residential amenities will be discussed below.

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

Principle

The site of the application falls within the Urban Edge as designated on the proposals map of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011). Therefore the principle of development is acceptable subject to the proposal not breaching policy 59.BE of the Local Plan, aimed at ensuring new development takes account of the host environment and will enhance the character and appearance of the locality.

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan outlines a number of criteria against which the development proposals will be assessed, stating that development must,

"take full and proper account of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and are appropriate in mass, scale, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings……."

and

"avoid unduly interfering, disturbing or conflicting uses, especially in terms of….overlooking, loss of daylight, loss of outlook…"

Also of relevance is the national planning policy set out in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development which states that, "Good design is indivisible from good planning" (para33) and that "Design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted" (key principle (iv) para13).

Character & appearance

The proposal, due to the scale, design and siting of the side facing dormer windows and the two storey rear extension, is considered to adversely affect the character and appearance of the bungalow and its relationship with the adjacent property, which together form a uniform pair.

The first proposed dormer window projects at the same height as the ridge of the existing dwelling and extends almost to the full width of the dwelling. This results in a very prominent and unsympathetic structure, and visually gives an appearance of an almost hip-to-gable alteration that unbalances the pair of bungalows to the detriment of the street scene. The second dormer, whilst lower in height, does not relate in design and scale to either the dwelling or to the first dormer, with them both giving an awkward and inconsistent appearance.

The rear two storey extension, in principle, is of an acceptable design. The roof follows the form of the original roof of the dwelling and in design terms, relates well to the original dwelling. The scale, however, is considered to be excessive in the context of the original dwelling. The extension, combined with the dormers will create a very awkward, unsympathetic and bulky form of overdevelopment that is made much worse with the odd side facing rear window-less dormer element also on the rear.

Whilst the principle of extending the dwelling, possibly even creating rooms at first floor level, is acceptable, the design needs to be carefully considered to take into account the character and scale of the original property and its relationship with the attached neighbour.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Residential Amenity

The proposal is considered to unacceptably affect the residential amenities of adjacent neighbours.

The issue of overlooking from the side facing dormers was carefully considered. The dormers will directly overlook the private garden are of the adjacent property to the south. No32 Yardley Road. They serve, however, the stairway to the first floor accommodation, and an en-suite bathroom and it would be reasonable to impose a condition that the windows have only high-level openings and obscure glazing in the event of an approval. For this reason, overlooking/loss of privacy does not form a reason for refusal.

The attached neighbour to the north, No36, is the property most affected by the proposal. The lounge for No36 is at the rear of the property with a single glazed door and two windows opening out onto a patio area. These windows and the patio are already slightly enclosed to the north due to the design and layout of the original dwelling. Any development that is close to the shared boundary will significantly impact this lounge and patio area, particularly with the change in levels between the internal floor level, the patio level and the garden level. It is acknowledged that to restrict any development along this boundary would be unreasonable, but the current proposal, due to its scale, design and siting, is considered to unacceptably affect the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupier of No36 in respect of the lounge and patio. The proposal doe not conflict with the light tests undertaken in accordance with the SPD: Quality Places. It is considered, however, to result in a significant negative impact in terms of being visually intrusive and overbearing. It will also create an adverse sense of enclosure. The harm is considered to be significant enough to warrant a refusal of the application.

Highway impact

There is more than adequate space for parking within the curtilage for a dwelling with four bedrooms. No objection on highway grounds.

Flood risk

The agent has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and the proposal is not considered to increase flood risk. 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

Recommendation is to refuse for the reasons stated above.

REF. NO. «AltRef»