HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/77472

DESCRIPTION	Two storey extension to existing garage with first floor windows and roof lights
ADDRESS	Gunners Keep Portsmouth Road Bursledon Southampton SO19 9PW

SITE VISIT DATE	15 December 2015
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	It is considered that sufficient information is available to allow for the assessment of the development proposed.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks approval for the construction of a two-storey extension to the rear of the property's existing detached garage. The extension measures 5m in depth, 9.1m in width and approximately 6.1m in height, with it having 4no. velux windows to each of its front and rear elevations, a side facing first floor window to its eastern side, as well as doors at the rear. The elevations of the structure will be a mixture of brick and grey green Cedral weatherboarding, with grey tiles to the roof. The development will provide for further garage space at ground floor level, with a games room and WC at first floor level.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is relatively flat and level.
TREES AND BOUNDARY TREATMENTS	There are no protected trees present on the application site. There is a mature hedgerow to the immediate eastern side of the property's existing garage which spans the length of this boundary and provides for important screening for the site from this side. There is further hedging to part of the front boundary of the plot with Portsmouth Road with the remainder being open to allow for vehicular access. The western boundary of the site frontage consists of timber fencing with there being metal gates separating this frontage from the property's garden beyond.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Gunners Keep is a detached single storey building which was formerly a Nissen hut prior to its conversion to its conversion to a dwellinghouse at the end of the 1990s. The building is set on a fairly large rectangular shaped plot to the northern side of Portsmouth Road from which vehicular access to the site is afforded. The plot frontage, which is laid to gravel hardstanding, contains a single storey pitched roof garage which an adjoining carport/covered area at the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site falls within designated countryside and forms part of the Strategic Gap which separates the settlements of Bursledon and Southampton. The application property forms the eastern most of a row of four detached dwellings set to the northern side of what is a semi-rural stretch of Portsmouth Road with green fields to the east and further to the north of the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/32313/001/00	OUTLINE:ERECTION OF DETACHED HOUSE AND GARAGE	REFUSED – 16/10/1991
Z/32313/002/00	OUTLINE: CONSTRUCTION OF DWELLING	REFUSED – 07/10/1997 (APPEAL DISMISSED – 15/04/1998)
Z/32313/003/00	CONVERSION AND REFURBISHMENT OF NISSEN HUT TO SINGLE DWELLING	PERMIT – 30/03/1999
Z/32313/004/00	RELIEF OF CONDITION 2 AND 10 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 32313/003 TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW JOINT ACCESS AND CLOSURE OF EXISTING JOINT ACCESS	PERMIT – 12/08/1999
Z/37531/000/00	CONSTRUCTION OF DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE	PERMIT – 20/03/2001

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Norbury Villa, Portsmouth Road	The occupiers of Norbury Villa made the following comments in respect of the application: • *The height of the roofline and ridge restricts our view from our overlooking side window, we feel the ridge height of 6.1 metres is excessive.* • *Because the proposed building is within 2.2m from our boundary and within 3.15 metres from our building, light entering this window is greatly reduced due to the height of the ridge.* • *We would, however, support an extension with a substantially reduced ridge height, thereby reducing the overbearing nature of the current design.* • *May we request that a planning condition be added preventing the proposed building from being used as living accommodation. Such a use would increase the traffic and already stretched services to the properties on an extremely busy road.* • *We have always maintained a neighbourly relationship with Mr and Mrs Lewis and trust this would continue. However, we are disappointed that we were not consulted in the initial stages prior to the application being submitted. Whilst we have no wish to request a refusal to a redesigned extension, we would ask that consideration be given to our comments.*

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hound Parish Council	No objection with the proviso that it is not for re-sale as an independent habitable dwelling in the future.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Designated Countryside Within Strategic Gap Outside Built-up Area Boundary

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies 1.CO, 2.CO, 9.CO, 59.BE.
Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising: 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, Policies S9, DM1, DM24, DM26.
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

N/A

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site does not fall within a designated special policy area.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework:

Of particular relevance to this application are both paragraph 17 which *inter alia* states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings; paragraph 109 which requires that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes; as well as *Section 7: Requiring good design* which stipulates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning; that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment; 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 and the way it functions.

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the principle of the development proposed, its layout and design, residential amenity, highway matters, and the impact of the proposals on the character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

The comments received are noted with the matters raised being covered in the below assessment of the proposals where appropriate.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

The comments received are noted with the matters raised being covered in the below assessment of the proposals where appropriate.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

There are no planning obligations requirements associated with this application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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."

Development Plan Policies:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011):

Saved Policy 1.CO aims to protect the countryside within the Borough and states that development will not be permitted outside the urban edge unless for agriculture, forestry, horticulture, outdoor recreation, essential public utilities or if it meets other criteria within the Local Plan.

Saved Policy 2.CO states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would physically or visually diminish a strategic gap.

Saved Policy 9.CO relates to domestic extensions to existing dwellings within designated countryside. This policy states that extensions within countryside will only be permitted if they meet certain Criteria, with the most relevant being that the development must not be likely to facilitate the subdivision of the property into more than one dwelling, the development does not result in the property being disproportionate in size to surrounding properties and the design does not materially worsen the impact of the dwelling on the surrounding countryside.

Saved Policy 59.BE 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.

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of the development proposed:

The site falls within designated countryside as set out in the adopted Local Plan, where there is a general presumption against residential development (Saved Policy 1.CO). Saved Policy 9.CO does, however, allow for the construction of domestic extensions to existing properties, which it is considered also applies to domestic outbuildings, subject to any proposed development conforming to the particular criteria as specified above. The principle of the development is therefore considered to be acceptable subject to the exact details of that proposed being deemed to be appropriate and to accord with the requirements of all of the relevant development plan policies and associated supplementary planning guidance.

Layout, design and impact upon the character of the area:

It is considered that the proposals are unacceptable and contrary to the requirements of Saved Policies 2.CO, 9.CO and 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan, as well as the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard. The proposed extension represents a substantial enlargement to what is at present a fairly modest single-storey detached garage, with the development spanning two-storeys in height, having a sizeable footprint of 45.5sqm, and serving to notably increase the floorspace of the structure, this being to the extent that it will not be dissimilar to

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

that of the dwellinghouse itself. It is considered that these factors combine to result in a building which is excessive in scale, size and height, and which is both disproportionate and non-subservient to the main dwelling.

In the latter regard, the matter of the potential use of the structure has been raised within the comments of Hound Parish Council and the representation made by the occupier of the adjacent property. Whilst there is no indication given within the submission that it would be used as a separate dwelling and conditional restrictions could be imposed to this effect, it could be argued that it may almost appear as this, such its unsubservient nature and overall visual impact. The structure is set in an advanced position within the plot and this, when combined with its design, overall scale and, in particular its two-storey height which will elevate it well above the dense boundary hedging that affords substantive screening to the current garage, will significantly and unacceptably increase the visual prominence of the structure from surrounding views, particularly those from the adjacent open fields and Portsmouth Road to the east and south. This being something which is considered to be accentuated by the proposed grey green exterior weatherboarding to each of the building's exterior elevations. In this regard, it is deemed that the development will have an unacceptable material impact upon the character of the countryside setting of the site and serve to contribute to the visual and physical diminishment of the strategic gap within which it falls.

Residential amenity:

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) requires that development avoids unduly impacting upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in particular by way of overbearing impact, loss of light or outlook, and overlooking. In this regard and owing to the siting of the proposed development and the application site itself, the main consideration concerns the impact upon the neighbouring residential property to the west of the site, Norbury Villa. The occupiers of this dwelling have raised concerns in relation to the proposals on the grounds of loss of outlook from and light to their facing side windows.

Whilst these comments are noted, it is not deemed that any such impact in this regard is unacceptable or contrary to the aforementioned policy requirement. Whilst the structure may be visible from the side facing windows of the neighbouring property, there will remain an acceptable degree of separation between the buildings (in excess of 3m), notwithstanding which the windows serve either non-primary habitable spaces (a stairwell) or are secondary windows within the rooms that they serve (the ground floor facing window is believed to serve a dining room or similar). There are also no side facing windows proposed within the eastern elevation of the garage extension and as such no overlooking will result.

For the reasons given, there is considered to be no conflict with Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) of the adopted Local Plan.

Highway matters:

Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles which includes an acceptable level of parking provision in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). There is considered to be no conflict with these requirements in respect of the development proposed with ample parking available on site by way of a combination of the property's graveled frontage and the enlarged detached garage structure the subject of this application. The site access is to remain unchanged and is deemed to be satisfactory to serve the development.

Conclusion:

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Overall for the reasons as set out above, the development is considered to conflict with the relevant development plan policies, associated supplementary planning documents, and national planning policy.

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

It is recommended that planning permission be refused.