HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/71884

DESCRIPTION	Single, two and three storey rear extension (amended description)
ADDRESS	4 Windmill Lodge Windmill Lane Bursledon Southampton SO31 8BE

SITE VISIT DATE	6.2.2013
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application is for a single, two and three storey extension located to the rear of the property. The three storey element of the proposed extension is shown to project 6.7m from the existing rear elevation. The extension will involve some excavation of the land immediately to the rear by approximately 50cm to facilitate the basement floor. The eaves height above the ground level, as excavated is shown ranging between 3.9m (north east side elevation) and 4.5m to 6.6m (side elevation facing no 2). The ridge height is shown at 9.9m. A dormer window is shown on the north east side elevation to bedroom. A single storey flat roof extension is shown of 2.7m in height. The ridge height of the roof will follow that existing and will be 10.6m high, above the excavated ground level. The plans show the extension used as a family room, a lounge and a bedroom. The proposed layout shows the relocation of the entrance to the dwelling from the rear elevation to front elevation of the proposed extension. An additional two parking spaces to the front of the extension.
TOPOGRAPHY	Land levels drop from the road down to the application site. As such, although the building is two storey to the front, the drop is land levels is such that there is small basement to the rear of the building where the application site is however this is currently accessed separately from the main entrance through an external side door and has a low ceiling.
TREES	A mature dense laurel hedge is located within the application site adjacent to the side boundary of unit 2 which is approx 3m in height.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	As above and 1.8m panel fence along same boundary. Other boundaries comprise mixture of fencing, trees, vegetation and hedging
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site forms part of a large two storey property which has been subdivided into four residential units. The application premises is located within a portion of the building facing the

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	rear garden and part of its rear garden is located adjacent to the rear garden of unit 2.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The area is semi rural in character with two storey detached and semi detached properties running along Windmill Lane

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/29275/014/00	CONVERSION OF REST HOME TO FOUR DWELLING UNITS	Permit 10/09/2002
F/12/70520	Three storey rear extension	Refused 16/07/2012

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
No 2 Windmill Lodge, Windmill Lane	Objection: Overlooking, loss of light, obstruction to rear access gate, loss of on site parking, insufficient parking on site, damage and disturbance from construction process, concern that extension will be used as separate rental unit creating further parking problems.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BUR	Objection on policies 3.CO and 9.CO and subdivision. Request for application to be considered at committee if recommendation of approval given.
ENG	The highway officer considers the property as having four bedrooms. The submitted plans however show the extended property with three bedrooms. Nevertheless, no objections are raised.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Local Gap Outside Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE, 1.C0, 3.CO, 9.CO
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1, S8 (Countryside and Countryside Gaps, DM26 (Residential extensions in the countryside)
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Site within countryside and as such not identified within character appraisals

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 countryside, gap, residential amenity, highway matters, trees, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
No comment				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
No comment					

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

Background

A planning application was submitted in 2012 for the erection of a three storey extension which was refused on grounds of harm to neighbouring residential amenity, noting the height and proximity of the extension to no. 2 Windmill Lane. The application was also refused on grounds that the extension resulted in a bulk of building, visible from the road, which would appear out of keeping with the character of the area, harmful to the countryside and gap designations.

The current application has amended the plans to show, amongst other things, a single and two storey element immediately adjacent to the boundary of no 2 Windmill Lodge and has pushed the three storey element of the extension further away from no. 2 Windmill Lodge and in a north easterly direction.

Assessment

The site is located with the countryside and within a local gap. As such policies 1.CO (Development in the countryside), 3.CO (Local Gaps), 9.CO (Extensions to dwellings in the countryside) and 59.BE (Promoting good design) of the Local Plan (2001-2011) and policies S8 (Countryside and Countryside Gaps and DM26 (Residential extensions in the countryside) of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Pre Submission (2011 - 2029) apply.
Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan (2001-2011) and policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Pre Submission (2011 - 2029) 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.

Principle

The site is located in the countryside and policy 1.CO permits development in the countryside where it is in accordance with a number of listed criteria, one of which is where the proposal would meet the criteria in other policies within the plan. One such policy is 9.CO which permits the extension of residential buildings provided a number of criteria are met those being that the dwelling in question is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition, that the extension would not facilitate the subdivision of the property into more than one dwelling, that the dwelling would not become disproportionate in size to neighbouring dwellings or to the plot on which it is proposed and the extension would not worsen the impact of the dwelling on its surroundings or the countryside in general. Policy 3.CO is also relevant and permits appropriate development where it can not be acceptably located elsewhere and where it would not diminish the Local Gap, either physically or visually.

Policy S8 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Pre Submission (2011 - 2029) also permits new development in the countryside provided the extension would not visually or physically diminish the countryside gap or have an urbanising effect on the openness of the gap. In addition the extension is required to be in accordance with policy DM26 (residential extensions in the countryside). Policy DM26 requires that the existing dwelling is lawful, that the extension would not be disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling, neighbouring properties or in relation to the plot and provided no additional dwellings are created.

Subject to meeting the criteria of this and other relevant local plan policy, the principle of development is acceptable. The impact upon the countryside, the local gap and character of the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

area and neighbouring residential amenity is discussed below.

Impact upon the Countryside

The Local Plan notes in paragraph 1.15 that, "*In recent years there has been increasing pressure to replace or extend properties in the countryside. These developments have often resulted in significant changes to the scale and character of the dwellings, which in turn have had a cumulative detrimental impact on the rural environment. Large new dwellings and extensions which don't reflect the rural vernacular and are insensitive to their location are not acceptable*."

The application site comprises a large two storey building, originally used as a rest home and after several extensions, was converted into four dwellings. The land levels on site down towards the rear garden and as such to the rear of the property the rear portion of no. 4 Windmill Lodge includes a basement level which comprises a gym, shower room and utility accessed by a separate entrance on the side elevation of the property. The character of the area comprises detached and semi detached dwellings with some mobile home dwellings diagonally opposite. The existing property, Windmill Lodge, is the largest in the road which is apparent from its depth. No other property has a similar depth and the existing property on site is therefore different from other properties in the road for this reason.

Despite the extension's location to the rear of the existing property and the mature laurel hedge of the front boundary, there are still views through the vehicular access of the site and specifically towards the side of the property where the extension is proposed. There are also clear views through the driveway and front boundary of the Coach House, immediately north east of the application site, to the point at which the extension is proposed. The building line of Gables Farm, west of the application site, is set back further from the road than Windmill Lodge which it is adjacent to. As such there are again clear views from the road at this point to the application property and its rear elevation.

The proposed extension shows a drop in ridge height of 60cm from the main roof of the house as existing, this is a slight reduction in bulk from the previous refusal however the proposal now shows the extension projecting 4m from the existing side elevation which is an additional 2.3m above that shown in the previously refused application. The extension at this point is two storey where the first floor is located in the roof. The roof at this point has a gable end which faces the road and terminates at the eaves of the roof of the main house. The extension at this point also shows a large dormer window and four velux windows on its north east elevation. The consequence is that the bulk of building here is increased. The original building on site has been extended during its life time as a rest home and it is considered that it would be difficult to extend beyond this without creating a mass of building uncharacteristic of the area. In the assessment of the previous application concerns were raised that the mass of building that would be visible from the road and excessive in bulk noting the typical form of development of two storey detached and semi detached dwellings. Despite the reduction in ridge height noted above, the extension would be more visible as viewed from the road than the previously refused application and therefore makes worse it impact of the bulk of building upon the character of the area. It is considered that the development is of a size and mass out of keeping with the general character of the area.

For these reasons the proposed development would appear out of place and would undermine the qualities of the countryside at this point. The property is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition however the extension in terms of its size and layout is such that could facilitate the relatively easy subdivision of no. 4 into two separate planning units. This would not be acceptable in that there would be insufficient parking to accommodate an additional unit and would further urbanise the site harmful to the character of the countryside designation. The proposed extension would double the size of the existing unit and as noted above would result in a mass of building considered to be disproportionate in size to neighbouring properties. The

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

proposed development is not therefore considered to be in keeping with the requirements of criteria ii), iii) and iv) of saved policy 9.CO of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2006) and draft policies S8 and DM26 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Pre Submission (2011 - 2029) in this respect. No reason for refusal in included in respect of the formation of a new planning unit as this does not formally form part of the planning application and in the event that permission were given for the extension, subdivision to form a separate planning unit would require the further submission of a formal planning application.

Visual and Physical Local Gap

As noted above, the extension is located to the rear of an existing building and the introduction of built form would be read in context of the existing building. As such the proposed extension is not considered to materially or significantly diminish the local gap. The nature of the development is such that it would not be reasonable to expect it to be sited elsewhere provided that it meets the aims of relevant local plan policies. As such the development is considered to be in accordance with policy 3.CO of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2006) in this respect.

Street scene and character of the area

The extension would be visible as viewed from the main road from several points including the driveway into the site. For the reasons noted under the heading 'Impact upon the Countryside', the mass of the proposed extension, specifically the depth of the building, as extended, and its height would be perceived from the road and would be out of keeping with the smaller two storey dwellings nearby. It is considered therefore that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan in this respect.

Residential amenity

To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places has been produced which gives guidance on over looking, loss of light and amenity space for new dwellings and extensions. No. 4 Windmill Lodge is attached to Nos. 2 and 3 Windmill Lodge where the subdivision of the rest home, as was, was permitted as noted in the history section above. As a consequence the rear elevation and garden of no. 2 is immediately adjacent to that of the application site. The 3 storey element of the extension would project 11m beyond the rear elevation of unit 2 and 6.7m beyond the rear elevation of the conservatory. Using the calculations set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD, the 45º lines of the existing building at no.4 already cover the rear windows of unit 2. It is not therefore considered that the levels of daylight received through the rear elevations of the building would be harmfully affected by the proposed extension. No. 2 has a conservatory to the rear and a decking area beyond that. 45º lines from the existing building cover half of the conservatory. The same 45º lines from the proposed extension would cover this conservatory in its entirety and the decking area and the levels of daylight into that room would be harmfully affected by the proposed extension.

The proposed rear elevation shows the ground level lowered by approximately 50cm to accommodate the extension. The land excavation would be immediately adjacent to the side boundary of no. 2. As such this will result is the immediate loss of at least 4m of the existing laurel hedge, which is in the grounds of the application site and approx 3m in height, despite plans which appear to show its retention. The elevations don't show the land level raised back up which would suggest the remainder of the hedge would need to be removed however in the case that the remainder of the hedge was capable of being retained it is questionable whether the extension could be built without damaging to the hedge and its roots or whether the remainder of the hedge would be able to survive in its existing manner noting the proximity of the three storey

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

element of the extension to the hedge and its roots. The hedge is approximately 3m in height and the extension approximately 7.1m in height or 6.3m above the ground level of the garden of no. 2. Noting the extensions proximity to the mutual boundary (2.3m at three storey) and its height, it is considered that the extension will appear visually dominant and will harmfully affect the outlook of the occupants at no. 2 Windmill Lane particularly from their conservatory, decking area and garden. The application is considered to be contrary to policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan and unacceptable therefore in this respect.

Two velux windows are shown on the south west elevation at second floor to a bedroom and are annotated on the plans as being a minimum of 1.7m above floor level, obscure glazed and non opening and such it is considered that there would be no harmful levels of overlooking and had a recommendation of approval been put forward a condition could have been attached to secure this. The windows on the rear elevation look principally onto the rear garden of the application site and comprise Juliette balconies only. The degree of overlooking from rear elevation windows is not therefore considered harmful onto neighbouring properties or above that which would be reasonably expected between residential properties.

The other side elevation, facing the Coach House, is located approx 8.5m from the side boundary to the Coach House. The north east elevation shows 3no. velux windows to a lounge at first floor and a window and velux at second floor level to a bedroom. The point at which the bedroom window at second floor is located is approximately is 10m from the side boundary. Given the distance involved, it is considered the overlooking would not be direct or harmful.

The extension would therefore be an unacceptable impact to amenities of neighbouring properties in respect of loss of light and outlook and the application is not considered to comply with policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2006) in this respect.

Highway matters

The Residential Parking Standards SPD requires that a three bedroom property provide two parking spaces. It is considered that there is ample space within the grounds of the property and its hard standing area to provide the necessary parking spaces and associated turning area. The proposed extension would not compromise this parking and turning space and as such there is no objection in this respect.

The development is considered to harm the intrinsic qualities of the countryside, the character and appearance of the area and the amenities of No. 2 Windmill Lane and is therefore considered to be contrary to policy 1.CO, 9.CO and 59.BE of Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

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 refuse.

REF. NO. «AltRef»