HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/11/69926

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side & rear extension (amended description)
ADDRESS	4 Hound Road Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5FX

SITE VISIT DATE	Visited as part of previous application and 19th Dec 2011.
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes – confirmed on site.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Application seeks to amend a previously refused application.
TOPOGRAPHY	No4 sits some 500mm higher than No6. Site is generally flat although the frontage does slope up from the highway.
TREES	None to be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open to front. 1.8m fencing along both side boundaries.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached cottage style dwelling. Small driveway to front and irregular shaped garden to rear with the boundary shared with No2 cutting across diagonally. Within the urban edge, surrounded by designated countryside.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential, comprising a general mix of properties. The group of cottages at the end of Hound Road is formed from two very similar pairs of semi-detached dwellings. Some have been extended at two storey level to the rear, with flat roof extensions. Rural feel to the area.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/11/68630	Construction of two storey side and rear extension	Refused 23rd Sep 2011

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Mr Wilson 6 Hound Road	• Several letters & emails received objecting and commenting on the proposal on the following grounds: o Overbearing impact o Loss of light o Bulky design which is out of keeping with existing property and street scene o Impact on ground stability o Inaccuracy of submitted plans

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
L Potter 2 Hound Road	• Objects to proposal on following grounds: o Inaccuracy of plans o Loss of privacy o Overbearing impact o No current examples of two storey side extensions o Adverse impact on pair of properties and street scene

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hound Parish Council	No objection
Environmental Health	I have reviewed the information provided and note that the application site is: Located adjacent to a former refuse tip, as shown on the 1965 edition of the historical Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping On highly permeable strata of sands and gravels Part of a semi-detached pair We recommend that the applicant is advised that: *The application site lies in close proximity to a former refuse tip. The presence of 'made ground' and / or contaminants in the ground cannot be ruled out and therefore we would recommend that the risks to the development be considered; including the design of the floor construction and the number / location of service penetrations. The applicant should* *also be advised to contact Environmental Health to discuss the above. In addition, we would recommend that this is brought to the attention of the Building Control officer. Should any information come to light during the demolition or construction works that indicates the presence, or the possible presence contaminated soils, then this should be* *brought to the attention of the Environmental Health Service.* *Further information and advice about developing 'Brownfield Land' can be found on the Council's website. The relevant web-page is entitled 'Development of Brownfield Land'.* In addition, because of the proximity of neighbouring properties, we recommend that the following conditions are imposed for amenity protection reasons: **NS05** - **HOURS OF WORK** No construction or demolition work must take place except between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays or 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. **NS21** - **DUST** Developments shall not begin until a scheme of works to deal with dust from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall then be implemented and retained to the satisfaction of the local Planning Authority.

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 : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

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

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Comments noted. The information detailed by the EHO will be added as a note to applicant on the decision notice. The condition relating to hours of construction is considered to be reasonable and necessary given the proximity of the neighbouring properties and somewhat rural location. The condition regarding dust on site is not considered to comply with the tests set out in Circular 11/95 in that is not strictly necessary ie, the application would not be refused were this condition not imposed.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
The issues raised regarding the impact on residential amenities will be discussed below. In terms of the accuracy of the plans, the case officer confirmed on site that the plans submitted by the agent are accurate.					

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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.

History

The previous application was refused for two reasons, the first being the impact on the amenities of No2 (loss of privacy) and No6 (overbearing visual impact) and the second being on grounds of unsympathetic design.

Following the refusal, the case officer advised that pre-application discussions should take place with amended plans submitted prior to any formal resubmission. No plans were submitted for consideration, with the new formal application just being submitted.

The current application originally showed the following alterations to the scheme:

- alterations to the internal configuration at first floor level with associated amended windows to the rear elevation. This results in one obscure glazed bathroom window and one angled bedroom window to replace the previously refused bedroom windows.
- the side facing ground floor window of No6 has been added to the block plan to demonstrate the relationship to the proposed extension

There were no alterations to the scale, overall design or siting of the extensions, and the initial submission of the current application was therefore not considered to adequately address all the reasons for refusal.

Following negotiations with the applicant/agent, amended plans were submitted to show an amended roof design. The ridge has been dropped in height resulting in a flat section of roof, which significantly reduces the visual bulk and gives a more sympathetic and subservient appearance.

The amended proposal is considered to comply with the relevant local plan policies for the following reasons:

- The size and design of the extension is now considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality. The amended roof design significantly reduces the visual bulk and gives a much more subservient and sympathetic appearance. In terms of the impact on the street scene, due to the reduced roof height, the set position and the width, the extension is not considered to unbalance the pair of properties or adversely affect the appearance of the street

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

scene.

- The previous application was refused on grounds that the extension would result in an unacceptable overbearing visual impact on the side facing ground floor window belonging to No6. Whilst the position of the extension has not altered, the plans now accurately show the position of the window on No6 and clearly demonstrate the relationship between this window and the proposed extension. The height of the roof has also now been reduced which will lessen any impact. On balance, it is felt that whilst the extension will naturally have some impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No6, it cannot be demonstrated that the harm will be so significant that it warrants a refusal of the proposal.
- In terms of over looking, whilst fairly unusual, the amended window layout on the rear elevation is considered to address the previous reason for refusal and is something that has been shown to be successful on other developments. The bathroom window will be obscurely glazed, and this can be restricted by planning condition. The bedroom window, due to the angled position will afford views over the garden of the applicant and not the adjacent property, No2. Considering there is a bedroom window, set back from the boundary, which already overlooks the garden of No2, the amended proposal is not considered to result in a material increase in overlooking or unacceptable loss of privacy.
- The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

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 permit for the reasons stated above.