HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/75809

DESCRIPTION	Single storey side extension and two storey side extension
ADDRESS	20 Bishops Court Bishopstoke Eastleigh SO50 6PE

SITE VISIT DATE	27th January 2015
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal includes the flowing elements: • Single storey side extension to the NE allowing an enlarged kitchen/utility. • Increase in the footprint of the existing two storey extension and raising of the roof to allow additional living and bedroom accommodation.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site slopes considerable with the road sloping steeply in an easterly direction. The site slopes upwards in a SW direction giving the property an elevation position to the road. The rear of the site is relatively flat with only a few steps towards the SW boundary.
TREES	TPO26/A1 – All tree species in the area Several trees within the garden area but all pre-date the TPO.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front of the property is relatively open with low level walling however some of the planting ong the frontage is now quite tall. The rear is enclosed by a combination of concrete post and wire fencing and 1.8m fencing with mature, dense, and tall planting in places.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Large, previously extended, detached two storey house set on elevated land. The property is set skew to the road with a detached double garage and driveway to the side. To the rear is an enclosed garden area
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area made up of large detached properties on generous plots. Properties are built relative to the slope of the land so properties SW of Bishops court on elevated ground with properties behind in Saville Close being on higher ground again.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/26094/000	Two storey side extension	Refused 13/7/1982
Z/26094/002	Two storey side extension	Permitted 30/9/1982

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	Various tree applications	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
2 Saville Close	Objected to the proposal on the basis that: • The extension would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy • Extension is far to large and intrusive • the extension results in an overdeveloped property • result in the devaluation of properties • Extensive garden could provide opportunities for development elsewhere instead of as proposed • Light pollution from existing flood light
1 Saville Close	Objected to the proposal on the basis that: • the extension has already been extended. • the proposal will make the property extremely large • the extension adds to the overdevelopment of the area • result in a loss of privacy • result in the devaluation of neighbouring properties
19 Bishops Court	Raised concern with regard to: • the close proximity of the single storey extension to the boundary • potential for side windows being inserted at a later date that would overlook No.19s lounge resulting in a loss of privacy • the potential necessity to remove the boundary wall to allow the development

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Bishopstoke Parish Council	No comments received.
Head of Countryside and Trees (Tree Officer)	I can confirm that I do not have any arboricultural concerns, therefore do not object to the current proposal. The Tree Preservation Order is an Area Order confirmed on 22nd September 1976, thus only affording protection to tree that where present before the confirmation date.

POLICY CONTEXT

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

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

2014', emerging 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 31

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, trees, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	x	
Noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received		See below	x	
Concerns over the ownership of the boundary and matters relating to the boundary and the ability to implement any forthcoming planning permission are civil matters to be resolved between the respective land/home owners and are not material planning considerations. Planning Permission does not convey the right to go into/onto/under/over land not within the applicants overship and a note to applicant to this effect has been added. All other matters are noted and addressed below.				

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 use of the extension as an annex has already been considered and accepted under application Z/26094/002 with conditions preventing subdivision. The proposed two storey extension will see this annex enlarged therefore these conditions have been imposed to the larger annex as it remains unsuitable for sub-division.

Layout/Design: The proposed single storey extension will extend the existing lean too bringing it closer to the highway and boundary. This is a modest extension that assimilates well to the existing lean too with matching materials, roof pitch and fenestration.

The proposed enlargement of the existing two storey extension will see the footprint increased bringing the front elevation further forward by 0.8m and extending the side wall out by 1m. This is considered a modest increase in footprint. The proposal will result in an amended roof form which will see the eaves raised and the ridge increased by 1.7m to create full head height at first floor. These amendments will result in the existing side extension appearing larger but it will still exhibit elements of subservience with it still being set back from the principle elevation and the ridge being reduced in height from the main roof.

Overall these amendments are considered acceptable and will not result in detrimental harm to the character or appearance of the existing property.

Residential Amenity: The single storey side extension due to its modest size and location is not considered to result in any loss of amenity. Due to its position in relation to the neighbour at No.19 however and its close proximity to the boundary a condition preventing the insertion of any side windows into this elevation is recommended to ensure their privacy is protected.

The two storey extension, as noted above will see the footprint of the existing extension increased, the eaves raised, and the ridge increased by 1.7m to create full head height at first floor. The existing extension has only a rear facing dormer window. The development will see the introduction of 3.no roof lights facing front and rear. Front and rear windows are also proposed. Unusually the first floor of the annex is proposed to be the main habitable living area which does raise some concerns over conflicts of use, particularly opportunities for overlooking of neighbouring gardens throughout the day. Amended plans have however been provided that reduce the openings removing the side window and replacing the bi-fold doors and Juliette balcony with conventional windows. These amendments reduce opportunities for overlooking. With only one additional rear facing window (one exists at present) and due to the orientation of the building in relation to its neighbours and the size/position of the proposed roof lights and windows mean

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

that any overlooking is not considered to result in detrimental harm over and above the existing arrangement.

Street Scene/Character Area: The property has a 1.5/2 storey annex to the side already. The proposed extension works, although making the annex larger are obscured in part by the detached garage on the frontage and will not vastly alter the appearance of the property. As discussed above the extension remains subservient to the host property and thus is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the host property. On balance although the property will increase in size, due to the appropriate scale and form of extensions there are not considered to be any detrimental impacts on the street scene or wider character of the area.

Trees: There are no significant or protected trees within close proximity to the proposed development and therefore there is no risk of harm.

Other Matters: The site is considered to retain a good sized garden and sufficient parking on the frontage and within the garage is provided 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.