HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. C/15/77017

DESCRIPTION	Retention of single storey rear extension (part retrospective)
ADDRESS	3 Abbey Hill Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5FB

SITE VISIT	Yes
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Construction of a flat roof single storey rear extension with roof lanterns. The extension measures 8.7m(w) by 3.6m to 5.5m(d) by 3.2m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat
TREES	There is a mature bay tree and a number of mature ash trees close to the extension.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The site boundaries consist of a mixture of close boarded fencing, hedging, trees and other vegetation. The long two storey side wall of The Coach House forms the eastern side boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey semi detached house with small single storey extension which is being removed to make way for the proposal.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is located within a row of mixed residential properties in Netley Conservation Area.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
1 letter of objection	• The visual impact and the loss of light to the neighbours dining room and patio area. • The materials used are "brickwork to match existing" as stated on the planning application. The flank wall facing our property and it being a patchwork of rough unfinished and exposed blockwork. • Impact on the mature bay tree, the tree roots will have been damaged in the excavation of the footings and preparatory works. There are 3 mature ash trees in falling distance of the extension. • The main sewer for the houses in Abbey Hill runs across the back gardens of the property and would be either under or very close to the new structure. There is also a soak away for the guttering

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	downpipes of both house that would be under the corner of the new building. • The retrospective application does not represent the true facts or situation as declared in section 13. Work on this extension commenced around late 2014 and long before the stated date on the planning application in section 3

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hound Parish Council	No objection
Conservation Officer	Any building proposal in a conservation area should enhance that area. From the drawings available at present this objective is not achieved, nor is it considerate to the next door neighbour at no4. There is no design and access statement nor any drawings showing the proposal in context. From what we are told, it would appear the building is not being constructed in accordance with the drawings, which themselves could be economical with the facts and may well be infringing building regulations too. One would expect the proposal to bear some relevance to the host building by taking a similar form, similar windows, same materials and appear to be part of it. This extension could be anything anywhere. The windows are completely different to the main house and the roof being flat produces a much higher eave than would any form of pitched one, which would be a far superior addition.
Tree Team	No objection to the proposal that is already under construction. • The application was however factual incorrect. There are trees within falling distance of the development. • The development will have no impact on the ash trees. • The multi-stemmed bay tree situated adjacent to the development on the property of 4 Abbey Hill has been pruned to facilitate the build and possibly has had roots severed to accommodate the foundation. My assessment of the tree is that the stability and overall health of the tree should not be severely affected by the development.
Ecology Officer	No objection Although the property is surrounded by woodland and there are a number of ancient woodland blocks within the locality identified as Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation, as the proposals did not involve demolition of buildings and felling of trees there will have been no impact on bats as a result of the construction works carried out on site. Due to the surrounding habitats however there could have been harm to ground dwelling species such as reptiles which are protected from harm under the Wildlife and Countryside Act. This will depend whether the habitat disturbed was mown or wilder habitat. In any instance disturbance

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	could not be proved. Due to the fact that any habitat for protected species is likely to have already been removed I have no objection to the work continuing.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Outside the Built Up Area Boundary - Countryside Within Strategic Gap Within Designated Conservation Area - Netley Abbey

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies: 2.CO, 9.CO, 59.BE & 169.LB

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014: DM1, DM10, DM26 & S9 (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

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not Within Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

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

None received		See below		

The comments are noted. However, the application is retrospective and so the changes cannot be made without substantial work to the extension. In terms of the suggested pitched roof, this is unlikely to reduce overall bulk of the extension as although it will have lower eaves this gain is likely to be offset by a higher ridge.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	X	

- The extensions appearance and its impact on the trees and amenity of neighbouring residents will be discussed in the assessment section.
- The extensions impact on the sewer and soakaway are not material planning considerations.
- The comments in relation to the inconsistences on the application form have been noted and a full site visit took place to assess the situation.

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

The proposal is located within the strategic gap, where development is covered by Policy 2.CO. However, the extent of the single storey householder extension means that it will not significantly diminish the gap (either physically or visually).

The property is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition and the proposal is not likely facilitate the subdivision of the property into more than one dwelling. As such Policy 9.CO is applicable, which allows extensions to existing dwellings in the countryside providing they will not become disproportionate in size to neighbouring properties or disproportionate in relation to its plot; and the design of the extension does not materially worsen the impact of the dwelling on its immediate surroundings or the countryside in general.

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.

169.LB - permits extensions to buildings in Conservation Areas provided the proposal preserves or enhances and does not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; the mass, form and materials are appropriate to the existing and adjoining buildings; architectural details of value are retained and that the proposal does not generate excessive traffic, parking or noise or cause harm to the local environment.

ASSESSMENT

Character and Appearance

The Conservation Officer comments are noted, in that the extension's flat roof design, window positioning and materials does not relate well to that of the house and would detract from the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

character and appearance of the Netley Conservation Area. While it is agreed that a pitched roof design would have better suited the features of the house, this design of flat roof extension is commonly found on residential properties and the extension only falls outside of permitted development due to its depth. At present the extension is unfinished and is an unattractive mix of blockwork. However, it is due to be rendered an off white colour, which will improve its finish and its relationship to the house. The proposal replaces a smaller white rendered extension and overall is not considered to materially detract from the appearance of the two storey house.

Conservation Area and Countryside location
Although the site is included within the Netley Conservation Area, the dwelling is not listed as of importance within the Conservation Area Appraisal and its rear garden is mostly dominated by the long two storey brown rendered side wall of the neighbouring building (The Coach House). The extension cannot be viewed from the public realm, and is therefore considered to preserve the character and appearance of this section of the Netley Conservation Area. Likewise it is also not considered to materially worsen the impact of the dwelling on its immediate surroundings or the countryside in general.

Residential Amenity
The rear extension is 5.5m deep and sits alongside the boundary with 4 Coach Road. It is a single storey extension so that only the top section is visible over the high boundary fence. Although the proposal can be viewed from the neighbouring dwelling it is not considered to be overbearing. It is understood that an offer has been made by the applicant to render the side of the extension and if accepted this will improve the extensions unfinished appearance when viewed from the neighbouring garden.

In terms of daylight, the proposal passes the test outlined in Quality Places SPD. It is also not considered to materially affect the sunlight received into the neighbours dining room patio doors, particularly when taking into account the impact of the existing multi stemmed bay tree. There are no side facing windows in the extension and the roof lanterns are high enough off floor level so as not to result in overlooking. Overall the extension is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties (by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking).

Other Considerations

- The size of the single storey extension is considered to be in proportion to the existing house and neighbouring dwellings and the property will retain a good sized garden.
- The Tree Officer has viewed the site and has raised no arboricultural objection to the proposal. The development having no impact on the ash trees and no severe effect on the stability and overall health of the multi stem bay tree in the neighbours garden. Likewise no objection has been raised by the Ecology Officer.
- 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

CONCLUSION

Recommend Permit