REF. NO.C/14/74525

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Two storey & single storey extension to form link between house & garage 25 Crowsport Hamble-Le-Rice Southampton SO31 4HG

SITE VISIT DATE	8/5/2014 and 5/6/2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application is for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension which will be attached to both the house and the detached garage linking the two together, the existing double garage is proposed to be part converted to a single garage and a bedroom, the erection of an open porch at the existing entrance point to the house, a two storey and first floor side extension on the west elevation which is shown to project out from the side of the house by 3.9m at ground level and 5.1m at first floor level (that variation between the two taking into account the existing single storey side projection on the house).The application will result in the reconfiguration of the house with the kitchen area moved to the ground floor and a five bedroom property. The agent has confirmed in writing that the extension will not be used as an annexe.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	n/a
TOPOGRAPHY	Site is located at one of the highest points in Crowsport Estate. The site drops from the front to the back, with the side garden being partially terraced. To the rear, no 26 is on lower ground.
TREES	No trees affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mix of fencing and high hedging (2m).
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site comprises a two storey detached dwelling and a detached double garage. To the rear of the site is a footpath which links Crowsport to Satchell Lane.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is located in residential area and within a special policy Area, Crowsport Estate which has a unique character of its own comprising modern style flat roofed buildings of cubic form which are rendered white. Although the estate mainly comprises single storey structures to begin within, this has changed over the years, partly in light of appeal

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	decisions so that now the estate is characterised by both two storey and single storey structures of this type. Nos. 24 to 28 Satchell Lane back onto the application site, separated by a footpath. Nos. 15 and 16 Crowsport (bungalows), south east of the application site are accessed from Satchell Lane. No. 7 Crowsport, is north west of the site. No. 26 Crowsport is also a bungalow.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/07/60843	Two storey and first floor extensions and erection of replacement balustrade and roof terrace (amended design to include raising of parapet wall by 0.5m)	Permit 02/11/2007
F/07/59514	Two storey and first floor extensions and erection of replacement balustrade and roof terrace (amended design to F/06/57876)	Permit 04/05/2007
F/06/57876	Two-storey side and first floor extensions and erection of replacement balustrading on roof terrace	Permit 03/11/2006
Z/29043/000/00	FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION	Refuse 05/11/1986
Z/29043/001/00	ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING DWELLING	Permit 02/04/1987
Z/29043/002/00	CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.	Permit 30/03/1999
Z/29043/003/00	CONSTRUCTION OF GARAGE/WORKSHOP FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE	Permit 11/07/2003
C/13/72866	Single storey extension to link house with existing double garage into habitable accommodation (amended scheme)	Permit 21/08/2013
28 Satchell Lane		
F/05/53549	Single storey side and rear extensions and addition of first floor	Permit 10/05/2005
7 Crowsport Estate Hamble		
Z/39390/001/00	FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION	Refuse 09/07/2003 Appeal Dismissed 21/01/2004
24 Crowsport Estate Hamble		
Z/36362/003/00	CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT AND REAR AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSIONS	Permit 30/03/2001

REF. NO.C/14/74525

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/36362/004/00	CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT and REAR AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSIONS	Permit 10/06/2002
23 Crowsport Hamble		
F/05/54536	First floor extension and addition of safety railings to part of existing roof	Permit 07/12/2005
21 Crowsport Hamble-Le-Rice		
C/12/70939	Two storey front extension, provision of canopy roof to front entrance, raising of roof to provide first floor accommodation and addition of glass balustrade to existing roof terrace	Permit 08/01/2013
22 Crowsport Hamble-Le-Rice		
C/10/67977	Construction of replacement 2 storey dwelling	Permit 05/01/2011
F/06/58346	Construction of first floor and single storey extensions	Permit 04/01/2007
20 Crowsport Hamble-Le-Rice		
C/13/71906	Extension of time limit for construction of two storey and first floor extension (C/09/66106)	Permit 13/02/2013
19 Crowsport Hamble-Le-Rice		
F/06/56512	Construction of single storey front and side and first floor extensions with front boundary, following demolition of existing garage and entrance porch	Permit 23/05/2006
27 Crowsport Estate Hamble		
Z/34359/002/00	CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY AND TWO STOREY EXTENSIONS	Permit 08/07/1999
Z/34359/004/00	FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION	Refuse 11/01/2000 Appeal allowed 23/10/2000
C/11/69820	Single storey side extension, first floor rear glazed extension and elevational alterations.	Permit 02/12/2011
5 Crowsport Hamble-le-Rice		
C/08/63584	Construction of replacement dwelling (amended scheme) (2 storey)	Permit 01/12/2008
10 Crowsport Estate Hamble		

REF. NO.C/14/74525

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/36435/002/00	CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS, FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION AND REPLACEMENT DOUBLE GARAGE	Permit 23/04/2001
11 Crowsport Hamble-Le-Rice		
C/11/69158	Single storey side and rear extensions, external staircase, new parapet walls, balustrading, formation of roof terrace and raised decking	Permit 14/09/2011
27 Crowsport Estate Hamble		
Z/34359/002/00	CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY AND TWO STOREY EXTENSIONS	Permit 08/07/1999
Z/34359/004/00	FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION	Refused 11/01/2000 Appeal Allowed 23/10/2000

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUPS	
OTHER	
24 Satchell Lane	Objection: Over development; Overlooking into our bedroom windows, affording us even less privacy as already there is a large window overlooking us and the extension would be even closer.
26 Satchell Lane	Objection: Overlooking
28 Satchell Lane	Objection: Overlooking noting proximity and window size, Overdevelopment

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CROWS	No Comments received
HPP	No comments received
ENG	No objection subject to condition
HAM	It was resolved to leave the decision to the Officer

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Crowsport Special Policy Area Within a Hamble Conservation Area

REF. NO.C/14/74525

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Special Protection Area-recreational disturbance zone

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) saved policies 59.BE, 169.LB, 184.LB
Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1 and DM10

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework
Para 12 One of the core principles - conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations
Para 65 Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits).
Para 129 Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset). They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
Para 131 In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of: the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
Para 137 Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

No comment

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

No comment

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATION

n/a

REF. NO.C/14/74525

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 74(3) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that Section 66(1) of the Act applies. This indicates that in considering whether to grant Conservation Area consent:

> *"The Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."*

In addition, Section 72(1) of the Act states:

> *"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area of any powers (under the Planning Acts), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."*

The application site lies within the Hamble-le-Rice Conservation Area and the Crowsport Special Policy Area, and is therefore assessed against saved Policies 169.LB and 184.LB of the adopted Local Plan. Policy 184.LB states 'In order to protect the special character of Crowsport, development including extensions, will not be permitted unless the size, scale and architectural style, materials proposed and detailing closely reflect that of the existing development'.

Policy 169.B is a generic policy for conservation areas seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area through appropriate design, materials and scale of new development. This guidance is supported by saved Policy 59.BE, which requires proposals to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood, and to be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

The Hamble Conservation Area guidance note advices;

In order to preserve Crowsport unique style; developments including extensions will not be permitted unless the design reflects the scale, form and character of the estate and has:

i. roof forms that are flat with parapets, ii. walls that are of white render, iii. Windows that are of a simple, rectangular form without glazing bars, iv. First floor extensions that do not exceed 50% of the area of the ground floor.

The revised draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 shows the Special Policy Area deleted from the proposals map however it is not been adopted and the possible future removal of the Crowsport Special Policy Area would not affect the determination of the application noting the site currently remains within the Crowsport Special Policy Area and the requirements of policy 184.LB apply and furthermore even without this policy the proposal is still required to have consideration to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The layout of this section of Crowsport is one of individual plots which interlock with neighbouring properties, which results in a very close-knit feel between properties but with each house retaining its own sense of character. There is a need for consistency in considering applications relating to this cluster to ensure that the collective visual appearance of this group of houses does not detract from the special character of the estate, as well as the design of individual houses.

The scale, design, materials and proportions of the proposed extensions are appropriate to the existing dwelling and others on the estate. It is noted that several applications that previously were

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

refused for first floor and two storey extensions within the estate have been allowed at appeal and clearly the principle of two storey buildings within Crowsport is considered appropriate. There is sufficient space around the house as extended to accommodate the resultant bulk of building and as such the proposed extension is considered to be in keeping with and preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area and special policy area and the application is acceptable in this respect.

Residential amenity
In terms of residential amenity the application site is surrounded by residential properties. The extension however is orientated in a manner that does not follow conventional back to fronts layouts of more typical residential layouts.

Privacy and outlook.
The proposed extension will result in part in a two storey extension that moves closer to the west boundary of the site by between 5 to 7.5m. There will be corresponding new first floor windows on both the side and rear elevations. Although ground floor windows are also proposed these, by virtue of their ground floor location, will not result in harmful overlooking. The first floor side elevation windows (west elevation) will look in the direction of no. 28 Satchell Lane. There will be a distance of approx. 13m from the new first floor window to the rear boundary wall of that property. It is noted that land between the rear garden wall of no. 28 and part of the side boundary of the application site is also in the ownership of no. 28 even though is it outside of the defined curtilage of that property. Nevertheless that part of the property is used as an access, parking and turning area rather than a formal garden area. With this in mind, the actual distance of the first floor window to the closest point of no. 28's actual garden area (13m) is considered sufficient to avoid harmful levels of overlooking. For the same reasons the proposed extension is not considered to harm the outlook of that property also noting that the house at no. 28 will be located a distance of 32.5m approx. from the closest point of the extension. The same window on the west elevation is located approx. 6m from the closest point of the rear boundary of no. 26 Satchell Lane. That window (first floor west elevation) will have limited angled views over a small fraction of the rear garden of no. 26 Satchell Lane however as these views are not direct and over only small portion of the garden of no. 26 this is not considered to harmful overlooking. The rear elevation windows on the first floor would be located between 10 to 15m from the rear boundary of no. 26 Satchell Lane. This is considered a sufficient distance to ensure the application does not harmfully overlook no. 26 Satchell Lane.

A detached double garage sits between the proposed two storey extension and part of the rear boundary to no. 26 Satchell Lane. Furthermore the ground level where the extension is proposed is lower than that at both nos 26 and 28 Satchell Lane. This limits the visual impact of the extension to some degree however, in any event, the extension is considered sufficiently removed from the rear boundary of no. 26 (6m at its closest point to 17m) and it is considered overall that the extension will not be visually dominating as viewed from no. 26 Satchell Lane.

There are no windows proposed that would look in the direction of no. 7 Crowsport and this property is sufficiently removed from the site. It is considered there would no harmful impact arising from the proposed extension upon the residential amenity of that property.

In respect of no. 24 Satchell Lane the closest first floor rear windows would be located approx. 19m from the rear boundary of no. 24. This is considered a sufficient distance to avoid harmful overlooking. It is noted that a detached double garage sits between the proposed two storey extension and the rear boundary to no. 24 Satchell Lane The same distance (19m) applies in respect of the distance between the rear elevation of the two storey extension and the rear boundary of no.

REF. NO.C/14/74525

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

24 and as such it is considered there would be no harm to the outlook of no. 24 Satchell Lane.

In respect of nos. 15 and 16 Crowsport the rear elevation windows would be located between 8m to 9.5m from the rear boundary to nos. 15 and 16 Crowsport. The views from these windows are slightly at an angle in order to view nos. 15 and 16 and furthermore this part of the site is used as a large turning and parking area and as such the proposed extension is not considered to cause unacceptable levels of overlooking. There are no proposed first floor windows on the east elevation. The distance of 8m to 9.5m is considered sufficient to avoid harm to the outlook of nos. 15 to 16 Crowsport.

The proposed single storey extension is sufficiently small not to have a harmful affect upon the outlook of neighbouring properties or their privacy. Furthermore it is not considered to give rise to harm in any other respect upon the neighbouring residential amenity.

Highways
There is adequate existing driveway space to park 3 vehicles in accordance to the EBC Parking Standards for a 4+ bed dwelling. To ensure this is the case ongoing condition E03 is added, stipulating a minimum of 3 parking spaces.

Overall the scheme complies with saved policies 59.BE, 169.LB and 184.LB of the adopted Local Plan.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to permit.