HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/76215

DESCRIPTION	Hip to gable extension & construction of first floor rear extension including rear balcony, 4no. side facing roof lights & 2no. side facing first floor windows
ADDRESS	Daphne Botley Road Horton Heath Eastleigh SO50 7DW

SITE VISIT DATE	15/6/15
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Hip to gable extension & construction of first floor rear extension including rear balcony, 4no. side facing roof lights & 2no. side facing first floor windows
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat level site
TREES	No protected trees however there are numerous mature trees and hedges in the front and rear gardens.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front of the site is bound primarily by low level pillars, walls, and dense hedging. The rear is enclosed by 1.8m fencing and dense foliage from trees/hedges/planting
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached bungalow with a hipped roof set on a long fairly narrow plot with a generous front garden area, driveway leading along the southern boundary to a detached garage within the long rear garden area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area of mixed styles, designs, and sizes of properties

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/05/54698	Retrospective: Detached shed/store in rear garden	
Z/14688/001/00	Single storey rear extension with brick chimney (6.5 metres high)	Permitted 05-09-96

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Fair Oak Parish Council	No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

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

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising of the Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014' Policy DM1

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area – BiFOHH 26

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people" (para 56) and goes on to state that decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development (para 58).

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance 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	x	
Noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received	x	See below		
N/A				

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

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and emerging Policy DM1 of the Amended Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan both require 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 application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below.

The insertion of roof lights into the original front roof plane is considered PD as would the hip to gable extension had it not contained plain glazed floor windows within the newly created side gable wall.

Layout/Design: The insertion of the front roof lights and hip to gable extension are considered appropriate and sympathetic to the host property. The ridge and eves will remain the same height as the remaining roof form and the hip to gable will help redress the balance of the semi-detached pair of bungalows the neighbour 'Kenridge' of which did a similar roof extension in 1996.

The first floor rear extension will pull a pitched roof containing various roof lights out over the existing single storey extension creating a gable end containing a balcony area. This extension is generally considered acceptable and in keeping with the property and its neighbour 'Kenridge' who have undertaken a similar extension, albeit not as deep and with no balcony.

These roof alterations will allow the conversion of this modest bungalow into a 5 bed chalet but is not dissimilar is scale and form to works previously permitted next door.

Residential Amenity: The newly created gable end will not result in any overbearing impacts or loss of light/outlook. It does however contain 2.no side facing windows which each serve a bedroom. These windows overlook the southern (side) roof plane of neighbouring property Inchaban. Inchaban has no windows within its roof and appears to have been extended several times to the rear with a single storey extension and a conservatory. These extensions deflect and prevent any views that would otherwise be possible of the rear private amenity space of Inchaban. Overall it is considered that these windows can remain and be clear glazed.

With regard to the rear extension, this is proposed over the existing ground floor extension which projects 5.3m in total, approx 1.5m beyond the rear wall of neighbouring property Kenridge's two storey rear extension and roughly in line with the ground floor extensions and conservatory at Inchaban. Whilst the proposed rear extension is large it is set away from Inchiban approx 6.5m and only projects 1.6m further than Kenridges rear extension. The ridge remains the same height as the host property with the eaves only marginally higher. In view of these factors there are not considered to be any overbearing or loss of light impacts. The rear extension will be a fully glazed gable with a recessed balcony. The recess with the deep overhanging eaves prevents wider views of neighbouring gardens when inside the property. The balcony at only 1m deep is not big enough to allow sitting out and will not have any greater impact than a large glazed gable flush with the eaves. Whilst this area will allow views out, views from first floor windows of neighbouring gardens

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

are common in urban areas and do not give rise to detrimental overlooking mainly because bedrooms and gardens are used at different times of day.

Overall it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any detrimental loss of amenity.

Street Scene/Character Area: The proposed development will ultimately change its appearance within the street scene however the alterations to the roof, pulling the hip out to a gable to help redress the balance to the semi-detached pair of properties visually improving its appearance within the street scene.

Nature conservation: The proposal is not considered to result in a likely significant impact on a European Protected site (SPA,SAC or Ramsar). HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was not required for this development as it falls outside the designated zone of impact.

Other Matters: 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

Also of relevance is the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014. 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.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above this application is considered to comply with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE and emerging Policy DM1 and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.