HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/70508

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side & rear extension, following demolition of conservatory
ADDRESS	10 Chillerton Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5GU

SITE VISIT DATE	15/06/2012
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Extension design and scale matches the ridge height, roof gradient and depth of the original property, but sits 3m back from the front elevation. This result in the extension extending 3m to the rear with a flat roof two storey element across the rear of the property. The extension is to provide accommodation for a relative, comprising an entrance hall, lounge and wc at ground floor level with an additional bedroom with en suite wet room and space to enlarge the existing bedrooms at first floor level. A small lift is proposed to connect the new ground floor and first floor accommodation but it does still remain as part of the main dwelling, accessed internally at both levels.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level site.
TREES	None to be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.8m fencing encloses rear garden.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached property, forming one of four pairs situated on the entrance to Chillerton. Each pair is separated with pairs of detached single garages. There is quite a uniformity to this section of the street scene, with even spacing between the pairs.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area, with the immediate locality comprising uniform pairs of semis.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/07/60515	Two storey side & single storey rear extension **@ 9 Chillerton**	Refused 2007

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Miss Meadows 11 Chillerton	• Objection on grounds of overdevelopment, inadequate parking/impact on highway safety, excess number of bins, impact on light and the physical impact on her property

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hound Parish Council	• Observation • No objection. However, EBC need to address parking issues in the area with so many parking spaces having been taken up with extensions, parking in the road has become very difficult.
Transportation and Engineers	• The driveway construction will need to be undertaken by condition TH24 to ensure parking for 3 vehicles is available - at present the current occupiers are simply parking on the grass. Ideally, drop kerb widening should be completed in conjunction with this, enabling easier access. However this may well require (dependent on HCC) the lamp column moving to accommodate the additional driveway space. As such, whilst it would be ideal, it is not essential if this proves to not be an option. • Holding objection • This proposal is not satisfactory to have a widened crossover with a lighting column in the middle. HCC would expect the column to be relocated to avoid risk of collision. I am consulting HCC on application about how they would wish to deal with this application and respond again in due course.

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

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

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 area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	X	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
Other …Issues relating to light impact, parking and overdevelopment are discussed below. The physical impact of the proposal on the neighbour's property is not considered to be a material consideration. No part of the proposal will encroach outside of the property boundary. The proposal will not create the need for additional bins and this is not considered to be material in determining the application.					

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.

The proposal is to provide additional accommodation for an elderly relative at both ground floor and first floor, with a lift to link the two floors. The proposal has been assessed as a domestic extension as the accommodation is linked on both floors to the main dwelling and would still be used as a single dwelling.

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 guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design, "is indivisible from good planning" (para56) and that "permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area" (para64).

Character and appearance

The design, scale and siting are not considered to result in an addition that is sympathetic to the original dwelling or the street scene. Although it is to be set back some 3m from the front elevation, the extension will match the ridge height of the main property and is proposed to extend the full width of the spacing between the application property and the boundary shared with the adjacent property, No.11. This will create a very large, bulky and prominent feature that erodes the existing spacing between the two properties. This spacing is a characteristic of the street scene and gives the row of properties a strong uniformity and rhythm. The application property forms one of four pairs of semis that make up this section of Chillerton, with no first floor side extensions present. A previous application was refused in 2007 for two storey side extension at No9, the adjoining property, with the visual impact and loss of spacing between the properties constituting the reason for refusal.

The proposal is considered to conflict with both policy 59.BE in that the design does not take full and proper account of the context of the site and is not appropriate in scale. It also does not take the opportunity to improve the character or appearance of the area and is therefore at odds with national planning guidance regarding design.

Residential amenity

The proposed extension, at 3m in depth, is unlikely to result in an acceptable impact in terms of an overbearing visual impact for either neighbour. From the viewpoint of No9, the main kitchen window

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

is furthest from the shared boundary so although the extension will be clearly visible, it is not deemed to result in an unacceptable visual impact. From the viewpoint of No11, it will comprise a large and dominant structure, but due to the existing relationship between the properties and the position of No.11's conservatory it cannot be demonstrated that it will materially affect the occupier's amenities to such an extent as to warrant a refusal.

In terms of light impact, due to the relative window positions of the adjoined property, No9, the proposal does conflict with the guidance and tests set out on the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places. The failing of the light test for both the glazed door and window serving the kitchen of No11, indicates that the proposal is likely to have a significant impact on the level of light. The proposal is therefore at odds with criterion vii. in that it will unduly interfere with the adjoining property in terms of loss of daylight, to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers.

Parking

The proposal will remove some of the existing on-site parking. It will also create an additional bedroom, requiring a total of three on-site spaces, in accordance with the Council's adopted standards within the SPD: Residential Parking Standards. As the Council's Engineers have stated, there is space that could be used for parking to the front of the property but at present a lighting column sits right in the middle. Hampshire County Council Highways are unlikely to allow an extended dropped kerb without this being relocated. This issue, however, along with ensuring adequate parking is provided and retained, could be dealt with via planning conditions and is not considered to warrant a reason for refusal.

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 on grounds of adverse impact on the amenities of neighbours in terms of loss of light, and on grounds of it being a unsympathetic addition to the property, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene.

The applicant's reasons for applying are acknowledged but these cannot consider as material in determining the application. The case officer advised that some form of wrap around ground floor extension could be a solution, and could even be constructed without the need for planning permission. But this would not provide the applicant with the accommodation they require and so they declined.