HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/75194

DESCRIPTION	Two storey rear extension, first floor side and rear extension with front dormer window
ADDRESS	19 Oakwood Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 1LW

SITE VISIT DATE	14/10/2014, visit to number 21 on 23/10/14
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	• The application is proposing a two storey rear extension, first floor side and rear extension with front dormer window • The two storey rear extension would project 4.3 metres in depth, extend 5.3 metres in width and 7.2 metres in height • The first floor side and rear extension would project 9.3 metres in depth, extend 4.8 metres in width at the front elevation and 8.5 metres in width at the rear • The front dormer would extend 2.4 metres, 2.4 metres in height and 2.8 metres in depth
TOPOGRAPHY	• Flat and level
TREES	• No trees will be affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	• The boundary treatment consists of a 1.6 metre tall fence
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	• The application site contains a two storey detached dwelling • There is a two storey projecting gable and cat slide roof and dormer • At the front elevation there is an attached garage • At the rear there is dormer at first floor and a flat roof single storey rear extension
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	• The immediate surrounding area contains large detached dwellings that have been generally extended

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/04685/003/00	Rear extension, double integral garage to replace existing garage	Granted 12/8/1983

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
21 Oakwood Road	Some errors and omissions on the plan do not show details which could affect my property. 1. The existing garage wall is single skin, not double skin, as shown. 2. The present wall is built on the edge of the foundation. This is adequate for a single storey garage, but may not be safe for a two storey building. 3. The garage wall is shown as being parallel to other walls of No. 19. This is not the case, as it was built on the boundary, which is parallel to, and six feet from the north wall of No. 21. (This was established, and agreed with the previous owner of No. 19) The garage gets narrower towards the rear. 4. Since the present wall is abutting the boundary, any down pipes, or gutters added would be an incursion into my property, which I would not allow. 5. The natural light which we have enjoyed for forty years would be considerably reduced in our upstairs corridor, staircase, and hallway. In my opinion, the south wall of No 19 should be rebuilt, to position it centrally on its foundation, and build it parallel to the other walls in the property.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CFD	No comments received

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

Saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011)

Policy DM1 of the 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'

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011)

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

NA

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

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

NA

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

These will be addressed in the report.

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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

Impact on Character and Appearance of the Area

The first floor side and rear extension would be built on top of the existing garage which is attached the existing single storey rear extension and wraps around the rear of the dwelling, with a dormer.

The Quality Places SPD when discussing roof extensions, states that changes should be carefully considered. Further to which dormer windows can be difficult to incorporate into a roof without adversely affecting the appearance of the dwelling on the street.

A number of dwellings have been considerably extended on Oakwood Road, one of them being the neighbouring property number 17.

From the front elevation of the first floor side and rear extension would follow the pitch of the existing garage and would appear to be of a similar appearance as the catslide feature on the opposite side. This would lessen the bulk and mass of this element of the proposal and would be in keeping with the general style of neighbouring properties. The proposed dormer is considered to be proportionate and subservient addition and is therefore considered acceptable.
The proposed two storey rear extension would jut out by 1.5 metres beyond the rear of the rest of the extension, and like the rear element of the first floor side and rear extension the roof would be a gable end. Thus creating a triple gable end which would lessen the bulk of the roof profile at the rear. The proposed two storey rear extension would be a proportionate addition and is therefore considered acceptable.

The two storey rear extension, first floor side and rear extension with front dormer window would not result in any adverse harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or indeed the surrounding area in accordance with saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, and the Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011).

Residential Amenity

No part of the extension would extend further than the rear of the neighbouring properties eitherside. The application of the 45 Degree Code has demonstrated that the extension would not result in undue harm to the daylight to either of these occupiers.

Number 17 have a window which serves a habitable room on the ground floor, no further

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

windows will be inserted into the flank elevation, therefore the level of overlooking will be no different to what is already experienced. With regards to the impact to the occupiers of number 21, a velux window would be inserted into the roofslope which would serve a bathroom, owing to the fact that such windows do not afford a great deal of overlooking it is considered that there would be no undue harm to the privacy of these occupiers. Furthermore the windows at first floor

The occupiers of number 21 have raised objections mainly to do with party wall issues which are civil matters. One of the points raised related to a possible encroachment issue, the architect was asked to address the issues raised by this objector as well as the issue of encroachment where the architect stated this would not be the case. Below is the response to the neighbours questions.

1) I will check this point, however we can build an inner skin off the existing foundation if necessary. It is something we have done before and can be engineered out.
2) Again this is purely an engineering solution.
3) Most of the listed buildings in Winchester have side walls that are not parallel. Again it just makes the construction slightly more difficult but can be overcome.
4) It is no different to the current situation.
5) I agree that the natural light will be slightly reduced. However this elevation is North facing, so I think that this is a minor inconvenience given that none of the rooms affected are habitable rooms. When designing the scheme we decided to hip this elevation to ensure that any loss of light would be to a minimum. I respect that the current owners have lived there for many years and any change to the current situation is bound to be negative. However there are other similar extensions that have occurred within the road so the precedence in favour of a similar extension has already been established.

A site meeting was undertaken with the owners of number 21, where it was discussed that a lot of the issues that have been raised are not planning considerations. The neighbours were also told that as a matter of precaution the first floor element has been brought in to be in line to ensure there would be no encroachment.

The architect is correct in saying that loss of light to windows which serve bathrooms and landings are not habitable rooms and thus cannot be considered with the same virtue as loss of light to habitable rooms.

A Juliette balcony is proposed to be inserted to the rear of the proposed two storey rear extension. As these balcony's do not allow for practical use and are purely aesthetic, the perceived harm with regards to neighbouring occupiers privacy would be no different from a traditional window. In addition the level of overlooking from the rear to the occupiers eitherside would be no different to what is already experienced from the rear of the first floor.

The two storey rear extension, first floor side and rear extension with front dormer window would not result in any adverse harm to the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, in accordance with saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, and the Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011).

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 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

The two storey rear extension, first floor side and rear extension with front dormer window, represents a suitably designed householder extension which would not result in any adverse harm to the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, in accordance with saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, and the Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011).