HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/17/80048

DESCRIPTION	Erection of porch (retrospective)
ADDRESS	6 St Austell Close Bishopstoke Eastleigh SO50 6GQ

SITE VISIT DATE	Application site inspected 10th April 2017.
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	It is considered that sufficient information has been provided to allow for the assessment of the development proposed.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	In accordance with the Local Planning Authority's publicity of planning proposals all relevant neighbours have been consulted.

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks retrospective permission to retain a front storm porch to the property. The development comprises a mono pitched roof covering a floor area of 2.2 metres depth with a width of 2.9 metres. The height to eaves being 2.8 metre with the ridge height being 3.5 metres, taking account of ground levels. Currently the roof includes 1.2 metre canopy projecting from the front elevation.
TOPOGRAPHY	The land, St Austell Close, slopes gently up both from Truro Rise to the west and plot on raised ground from road. Porch on level ground.
TREES	There will be no trees affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The previously open frontage has been enclosed.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application relates to a two storey semi-detached residential property within the cul-de-sac of St Austell Close.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	1960's/70's minor housing expansion to the large inter-war/immediate post war housing estate to the west of Underwood Road. Predominately St Austell Close consists of pairs of staggered semi-detached houses with open plan frontages. The eight pairs of semi-detached comprising St Austell Close with original matching flat roofed porches. Allotments to the rear and Stoke Park Wood stretching away to the west.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/16/78985	Retention of single storey front extension. 6 St Austell Close, Bishopstoke.	Refused 18th October 2016

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Occupier 8 St Austell Close	Support. Examined the plans and know the site well. I wish to offer my support to the retrospective proposal.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Bishipstoke Parish Council	Object. The Planning Committee felt that nothing had changed since the previous retrospective planning application (F/16/78985), and as such the Borough's reasons for refusing that application still applied here. As such, the Committee wishes to object on the same grounds: "(1) As built, the front porch, in terms of its depth, width, height, design and overall appearance, represents an overly dominant and incongruous feature which is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the streetscene and its surroundings. As such the proposal fails to comply with saved Policy 59.BE of Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan (2001-2011) and the Council's 'Quality Places' and 'Character Area Appraisals' Supplementary Planning Documents."

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:

- 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 9
Guidance

- Maintain the formal building compositions around route intersections and open spaces.
- Maintain the predominant orientation of ridgelines in existing development relative to the slope.
- Retain the wide grass verges and associated semi-mature broadleaved planting along Underwood Road and West Drive.

- Maintain the importance of the open green spaces at the centre of loops in any new development.
- Maintain uniformity in building heights within each street.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The application site is not located within a Special Policy Area.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

Sections of the National Planning Policy Framework being 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, 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 residential amenity, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other – No consultations undertaken.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
Other – The letter of objection from the Bishopstoke Parish Council and letter of support from the occupier of 8 St Austell Close are acknowledged and reviewed in the "Assessment of Proposal" section of this report.					

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Household applications of this nature do not warrant Developer' Contributions to mitigate the impact of the proposal on the local infrastructure.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATIONS

The National Planning Policy Framework says that enforcement action is discretionary, and that local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. Section 73A of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 specifically provides that a granting

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

of planning permission may relate to development carried out before the date of the application' (paragraph 6). Furthermore, an application cannot be refused on grounds that it is retrospective. When considering the development regard has to be had to Government guidance and the policies contained within the Development Plan.

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 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, and loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

The principal of development of the site.
The application site lies within an established residential area where the principal of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependent on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable.

The proposals impact on the street scene and the character of the area.
This retrospective application for full planning permission proposes the retention of the existing storm porch situated at the front of the property, with an amended roof design and thereby removing the current roof and associated significant overhang. Whilst this revision goes some way to respond to the reason for planning refusal F/16/78985 for the retention of a single storey front extension. The dimensions of the footprint remaining virtually the same as the refused development, reflecting the built storm porch. It is acknowledged there are a number of examples of front porch additions within St Austell Close. The nearby properties numbered 4 and 8 St Austell Close having typical flat roofed plain square porches. Conversely, number 10 St Austell Close gained planning permission for a conservatory to the front of the house, planning permission Z/37698 dated 13th June 2001. It should be acknowledged that this development was significantly prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework that strongly highlighted the requirement 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. The current application does not respect the character of St Austell Close with houses having flat roofed plain square porches. The retention of this storm porch results in an overly dominate and incongruous feature situated in a prominent location, to the detriment of the original dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Furthermore, St Austell Close lies within the Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area (BIFOHH 9). This highlights the strength of the character being strong, with amongst other matters the skewed orientation of buildings and uniformity in building materials and massing.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

It should be acknowledged the opening paragraph of Eastleigh Borough Council, Local Plan (2001 – 2011) Urban Renaissance and the built environment "Promoting good design"

"Applicants for planning permission will be expected to demonstrate how they have taken account of the need for good design in their development proposals and that they have had regard to the relevant development plan policies and supplementary design guidance, in accordance with the Government's Planning Policy".

Notwithstanding the support from a local resident, the retention of the storm porch breaches Central and Local Government policies aimed at ensuring new development respects its host environment.

The impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings.

Notwithstanding the significant size of the porch, due to the location at the front of the premises the current private amenity area will not be compromised. Similarly, due to the relationship of the existing development with the staggered arrangement of the semi-detached pairs of housing, the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties will not be materially harmed.

Nature conservation

HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was not required for this development due to the low key nature of this house-holder application.

Conclusion.

The retention of the porch will result in an incongruous feature and contrary to the style of porches in the immediate locality.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons outlined in this report the recommendation is to refuse the planning application.