HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/78209

DESCRIPTION	Raising of roof to provide first floor accommodation
ADDRESS	Swallow Fields Allington Lane West End Southampton SO30 3HQ

SITE VISIT DATE	04/05/16
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?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application proposes raising the roof of the existing dwelling to create two storey dwelling. Additional accommodation would be created in the first floor of the dwelling.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is relatively flat and level
TREES	None that will be affected by the proposed development
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The eastern side boundary of the property's rear garden is marked by 2m high close boarded timber fencing. The western side boundary with The Meadows consists of a mixture of mature hedging and timber fencing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Swallow Fields is a detached bungalow on a long but narrow plot. The property is finished in a yellow render with concrete roof tiles and is set in a recessed position from the highway. The property has previously been extended at a two storey height to the rear in order to allow for the provision of first floor accommodation. The dwelling has a substantial detached garage to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The application dwelling forms part of a ribbon development of detached houses and bungalows situated to the northern side of Allington Lane and falling within designated countryside. These dwellings occupy long narrow plots with substantial rear gardens and are of a variety of sizes, designs and periods; a number have been extended to varying degrees in the past.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/14/75193	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing detached garage.	Granted 24/10/2014
Z/28186/000/00	Two storey rear extension	Granted 11/07/1985

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

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

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies 1.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 DM1, DM26
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

The site is not located within a character appraisal area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site is not located within a 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

POLICY COMMENTARY

character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	x	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received	x	See below			
Other …					

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."

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 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.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

The site falls within designated countryside where there is a general presumption against residential development (Saved Policy 1.CO). Saved Policy 9.CO, however, allows for the construction of domestic extensions to existing properties which conform to the criteria as specified above.

Layout, design and impact on the character of the area

The application proposes raising the roof of the existing dwelling to create a two storey extension. The existing property when viewed from the street has the appearance of a bungalow, when viewed from the rear it is clear there is existing accommodation in the roof due to two dormer windows at the rear of the property. It is considered that the proposed extensions to the dwelling would change the overall appearance of the dwelling, however, the roof of the dwelling would slope down to a low eaves level at the side of the dwelling and would have a partial hipped roof at the front and rear of the property. It is considered that the roof slope and hip would reduce the overall bulk of the proposed extensions. The proposed extensions are not considered to result in the dwelling becoming disproportionate in size to the neighbouring properties or disproportionate in relation to its plot.

The neighbouring property The Steading is a two storey dwelling and the neighbouring properties Peacehaven is a two storey dwelling with a similar designed roof to the current application. Whilst the proposed extensions would increase the height of the dwelling, it is considered that due to the dwelling being positioned further back into the plot than the neighbouring properties the proposal would not be prominent in the street scene. Having regard to the size and scale of the neighbouring properties the proposed alterations to the dwelling are not considered to cause material harm to the street scene or wider character of the area. The design of the extension does not materially worsen the impact of the dwelling on its immediate surroundings or the countryside in general.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy 1.CO, 9.CO and 59.BE of the Saved Local Plan.

The submitted plans show that the extensions would result in a 6 bedroom dwelling on the site. In accordance with the Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD 3 parking spaces on site would be required. There is space at the front of the site for parking at least three cars and therefore no objection is raised on these grounds.

It is noted that the eaves level on the side elevations does not correspond with the eaves level at the front and rear of the dwelling. This matter should be clarified in any further submissions.

Impact on residential amenity

The submitted block plan does not show the extensions that have been carried out on the neighbouring property – Peacehaven. The property has had significant extensions to the rear and the outbuilding shown on the block plan has been removed. The proposed alterations to the dwelling would result in the property being increased in height by 2.2m and the proposal would extend beyond the neighbouring property by approximately 4m. Whilst it is acknowledged that the roof of the proposed extension would slope away from the neighbouring property it is considered that due to the increase in height of the dwelling and the expanse of the roof extending beyond the rear of the dwelling right on the boundary with the neighbouring property, the proposal would result in an overly dominant extension to the neighbouring property. The proposal is therefore considered to cause

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

material harm to the amenities of the neighbouring property Peacehaven and conflicts with Policy 59.BE of the saved Local Plan.

The proposed extension would extend beyond the neighbouring property The Steading by 7m. It is considered that due to the increase in the height of the dwelling and the expanse of roof that would extend beyond the rear of the neighbouring property the proposal would result in an over bearing and over dominant extension to this neighbouring property. The proposal would therefore significantly impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property and conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Saved Local Plan.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would impact on the adjoining neighbours' amenity and would conflict with policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and paragraph 17 pf the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is noted that there are side facing windows on the ground and first floor of the neighbouring property The Steading. The ground floor window is a secondary window; the windows on the first floor serve a bathroom and a bedroom. These windows are conditioned to be obscurely glazed. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not result in a material loss of light to these side facing windows.

It is noted that permission has been granted for a single storey extension with a depth of 10m to the rear of the dwelling. This extension was a flat roof extension and is therefore not considered to justify the extensions under the current application.

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

The application is recommended for refusal.