HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/76509

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension to provide ancillary accommodation (annex), single storey rear extensions, conversion of loft space to provide habitable accommodation, including rear dormer window, following removal of existing garage. (Amended description)
ADDRESS	66 Kingsway, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 1FJ

SITE VISIT DATE	8/7/15
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes, amended elevation were sent 11 days before the date of determination which have been accepted and form part of the assessment
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Neighbours were re-consulted as the description of the proposal did not accurately take into account the exact nature of the application

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	• The application is proposing a two storey side extension to provide ancillary accommodation (annexe), single storey rear extensions, conversion of loft space to provide habitable accommodation, including rear dormer window, following removal of existing garage
TOPOGRAPHY	• No noticeable changes in site level
TREES	• The trees are protected but none would be affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	• Very dense hedges
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	• The application site contains a two storey detached dwelling • At the front elevation there is a pitched roof garage which is attached with the addition of a link • There is parking for 5-6 cars • At the rear there is a single storey rear extension which attaches to the garage

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	• The rear garden is well landscaped with mature planting
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	• The immediate surrounding area contains two storey detached dwellings many of which have been extended • The area is has a blanket tpo

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/05077/007/00	Elevational alterations to and re-roofing of side extension	Granted 08/02/1999
Z/05077/003/00	Two storey front extension	Granted 24/8/1987

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CFD	No comments received
ENG	No comments received
CRT	No objection subject to conditions

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 policy 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, policy DM1 (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)
Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas SPD (2005)

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards (2005)

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out twelve core principles that underpin the planning system, one of which is that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings". It goes on to say in paragraph 56 that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."
Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."
Paragraph 64 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, highway matters, trees, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received	X	See below		

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received	X	See below		

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 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.

Principle

The application site which is to be developed lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable. 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, cyclists and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, and noise and fumes. Also of relevance is Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

The proposal relates to the personal circumstances of the applicant and the extended family. Whilst there is sympathy, unfortunately these are not material planning considerations.

Layout, Design and Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Area

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and Policy DM1 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. This requirement is reiterated within the guidance contained within the Council's adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document, as well as in the NPPF which states 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" (paragraph 64).

The application site forms the Kingsway character area of the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas (2005). The SPD requires development to ensure that sufficient garden depths are retained and that the designs of buildings including extensions are compatible with the character of adjacent properties.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The application did not make any reference to the fact that a large element of the proposal (two storey side extension) would be for the purpose of an annex when the application was submitted. The concerns about the creation of an annex was discussed with the agent, as from the original plans the proposal would lead to an independent living accommodation with its own separate entrance and only the utility room to remain as a shared facility. The Local Planning Authority therefore considered it appropriate to amend the description and re-notify neighbours.

An amended proposed elevation plan was submitted very close to the date of determination which the Local Planning Authority has decided to take accept and take into consideration. The amended plan has removed the canopy and a small window but a door is shown. The existing front door now shows the addition of a canopy and has been annotated with the heading 'main entrance'.
Regardless of the alterations to the elevation to minimize the effect of a separate entrance, the proposed floor plans undoubtedly demonstrate that a separate unit of accommodation is the intention. The first floor plans do not show any link from the creation of a hallway that the two resultant bedrooms would be part of the main dwelling.

The Local Planning Authority is concerned with the high degree of independence proposed for the annex. The only internal link is the utility room, a front entrance is proposed, thus there is concern about the self - contained nature of the extension could result in the extension being occupied totally independently to the main dwelling as a two bed unit and this would be wholly unacceptable in this location.

The proposed single storey rear extension is considered acceptable owing to its small projection and width would be proportionate to the main house.

The Quality Places SPD states that the proportions of a building consist of the position and relative size of the different elements of the building when viewed from outside. When the proportions are right, none of the elements appear out of synch with the others.

Proposals for two storey side extensions should generally be set back to avoid a 'terracing effect' and to allow the main dwelling to maintain its dominance. No setback is proposed, in fact this element of the scheme would juts forward of the principle elevation by one metre. In some instances such an extension at the proposed width of five metres would be considered too great to consider this element acceptable, however it is noted that a number of dwellings on Kingsway are originally or extended with such front extensions and in this case this element is acceptable.

The Quality Places SPD states that, dormer windows can be difficult to incorporate into a roof without adversely affecting the appearance of the dwelling and the street. Furthermore, a dormer should not dominate the roof, but should complement the roof. From a site visit it was noted that neighbouring properties have rear dormers, therefore the addition of a dormer is not of concern. What is of concern is the overall bulk that would be apparent, leading to a top heavy appearance which would subsume the existing roof profile.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Residential Amenity

The Quality Places SPD requires proposals to take into account the relationship between neighbouring properties to ensure a reasonable level of daylight is achieved, and that a high standard of privacy is required when extending at the rear.

There would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking as there would not be significantly more overlooking than what is already experienced. The boundary treatment by way of the dense garden foliage would mask a large amount of the development thus there would be no any adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

Trees

There would be no harm any trees on site, which the Head of Countryside and Trees has not objected to either.

Parking

The proposed parking is acceptable and meets the requirements of the Residential Parking Standards SPD.

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

1) The proposal is considered to form an independent unit of accommodation, due to its physical size, characteristics and level of facilities. The layout of the proposed development and its relationship to neighbouring properties would be at odds with the prevailing character and pattern of residential properties within the locality. As such the proposal is contrary to 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 Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document (2011).
2) The proposed rear dormer owing to its size, siting and form, would result in an unsympathetic alteration to the roof, resulting in a visually intrusive feature therefore

CONCLUSION

failing to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policy 59.BE, Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, policy DM1 (the Submitted Local Plan), Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011).