REF. NO. «AltRef»

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Single storey front extension, single storey rear extensions, elevational alterations and rear decking. 45 Hocombe Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 5SP.

SITE VISIT DATE – 22/06/2012

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above to renovate the current dwelling. The extensions to the front and rear are relatively modest, the main works are extensive remodelling of the internal layout of the dwelling, as well as conversion of an existing car port to the western side into habitable accommodation.
SITE AREA	Approx 2720 sqm.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat and level.
TREES	There are a number of protected trees at the end of the garden but these will not be affected by the proposed works.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The site is quite open to the front compared to most Hocombe Road properties but the remaining boundaries are mature planting and shrubbery.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Tired 1950s bungalow which has had some poor extension work in the 1970s. Large wide plot with in and out double entrance drive, garage and car port to the front. To the rear is an existing patio area running the length of the dwelling with a large mature garden to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Hocombe Road sits on the edge of the Borough but still within the urban edge, although the land to the north is countryside. Hocombe Road and the area to the south is residential in nature and made up of large detached dwellings within large normally well screened plots.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/04966/003/00	Erection of car port.	Approved Mar 1985
Z/04966/001/00	Erection of extensions to existing dwelling.	Approved Apr 1972
4966	Bungalow and garage.	Approved 1956

REF. NO. «AltRef»

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
47 Hocombe Road	Object. Overdevelopment of the plot, change of use of the current car port to habitable accommodation on the boundary. Concerns of subsidence and damage to the existing boundary hedge. Overshadowing and visually intrusive, as well as noise and disturbance during construction and access problems to the rear of the site.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Chandler's Ford Parish Council	No objection.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Special Policy Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) : 59.BE & 181.LB
Supplementary Planning Document : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document : Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area – Hiltingbury and Hocombe Park Special Policy Area
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 upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, parking, the street scene and character of the Special Policy Area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

A response to the main issues raised is given below. With regards to issues of subsidence, this is not really a planning issue and is covered by Building Regulations. Nevertheless, the applicant's architect has provided information which shows that the existing foundations and wall of the current car port to the western side of the site can be reused, meaning that no ground works should be required and the existing boundary hedge should not need to be touched.

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 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. The main relevant policies in this instance are saved Policies 59.BE and 181.LB.

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.

Policy 181.LB relates specifically to the Hiltingbury and Hocombe Park Special Policy Area (SPA) and similarly to Policy 59.BE requires any new development within the SPA to be appropriate to the character of the surrounding area, not harm any mature trees or landscaping and it does not allow the sub-division of any plots if the resulting plots would be significantly smaller than those surrounding.

In principle terms therefore, the proposed extensions and alterations to the current bungalow are acceptable.

Layout & Design – As has been highlighted above, the application dwelling is rather tired and in need to modernisation. It also suffers from a poor internal layout as a result of extensions in the 1970s. The proposals are to square off the current front entrance area and move the main entrance to a more central position. To the rear will be a small single storey addition to provide a master bedroom and to the western side the existing large car port will be converted into habitable accommodation, as well as the addition of pitched roofs to existing flat roof areas. The main works will be internal remodelling to better use the existing space and make the most of the current accommodation. The works will also include repositioning a number of windows to the front and rear, as well as providing a new area of decking in place of the current patio which runs the length of the bungalow to the rear.

Overall this will result in a much improved dwelling both in its appearance and the way it functions for the applicants and their family without greatly increasing its size and bulk.

Residential Amenity – The main issues raised by the one objector to the application is that the conversion of the existing car port to the western side of the side will result in habitable accommodation directly on the boundary between the two properties with only a three metre gap between them. While it is noted that the site is large and that there may well be other options for providing this additional accommodation without pushing right up to the site

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

boundary, this car port already exists. It is also of a fairly substantial construction, having a full height brick wall along the boundary and a quite substantial roof to span the distance required. This car port was approved as part of the 1970s extensions to the dwelling and no restrictions were applied to its use or to say that it could not be converted to habitable accommodation at a later date. Given that it is not to be any larger in footprint, the car port could be converted without requiring formal planning approval, the only element of it requiring approval being the proposed pitched roof. This being the case, the application could not be refused on the grounds of the car port being converted, even if it was considered to be unacceptable.

As to the other issues raised of overshadowing and visual intrusion, these concerns again relate to the conversion of the car port to the western side of the site and its proposed pitched roof. The concern is that the increased height will result in loss of light to two windows within the side elevation of No.47 and be visually intrusive. The larger of these two windows serves a study which is not considered to be a main habitable room, meaning that a refusal on the grounds of impact to this window could not be substantiated in planning terms. The other window is a high level secondary window to the main bedroom of No.47, the main bedroom window being to the rear of the property. While the bedroom can be considered as a main habitable room, there is no real outlook from this high level window and the levels of light are unlikely to be affected given that the new pitched roof slopes away from No.47.

With regards to other amenity issues of disturbance during construction, this would only be for a temporary period, although the works required are quite extensive and it is felt that a condition restricting construction hours would be appropriate to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Parking – Although the car port to the side of the dwelling is to be converted, there will still be more than sufficient room to provide off-road parking for at least three cars, as required by the Council's Residential Parking SPD.

Street Scene & Area Character – Unusually for Hocombe Road the application site is actually quite open to the street at the front, although as with most Hocombe Road properties along this stretch it is set well back, so is not overly prominent. While the addition of a number of sections of pitched roof will increase the visual bulk of the dwelling to some degree, it will still retain its very low profile and should not therefore have any particularly adverse impact upon the street scene.

As to the resulting dwelling's impact upon the character of the SPA, as has been mentioned above, the current bungalow is looking a little tired and in need of refurbishment. The proposed alterations and additions are considered to achieve this in an acceptable and high quality way which it is felt will complement the SPA and set a standard for future development in the area.

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 proposals are considered to be acceptable and to accord with saved Policies 59.BE and 181.LB of the local plan, as well as the relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.