HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/77007

DESCRIPTION	First floor side extension with 6no. side facing roof lights
ADDRESS	Springfield Upper Northam Drive Hedge End Southampton SO30 4BG

SITE VISIT DATE	20 October 2015
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	It is considered that a sufficient level of 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 seeks approval for the construction of a first floor extension to the south-eastern side elevation of the dwelling which is to provide for an additional bedroom and associated en-suite bathroom. The extension is to be sited above the property's existing single storey side projection and will contain 6no. velux windows within its roof slope.
TOPOGRAPHY	There is a slope from south-east to north-west across the site in line with the general gradient of this section of Upper Northam Drive. This results in the internal floor level of the house being slightly elevated above the exterior ground level with steps up to the property's front door.
TREES	There will be no trees affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The property frontage is surrounded by a mixture of a low-level picket fence and concrete block wall. The site is open immediately alongside the existing single-storey side projection above which the proposed extension would be constructed. The remainder of the south-eastern side boundary alongside the highway (West Road) is marked by a concrete block wall.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Springfield is a three-bedroom, semi-detached red-brick property set on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Upper Northam Drive and West Road. The dwelling has previously been extended by way of a single-storey lean-to projection to its south-eastern side, as well as a single-storey extension/conservatory to the rear. A one-and-a-half storey detached outbuilding/store has also been constructed at the north-eastern end of the plot.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site falls within an established residential area made up of a row of eleven properties set to the north-eastern side of Upper Northam Drive as well as the cul-de-sac West Road which consists of a mix of one and two storey dwellings. Springfield is the end property in a short row of three pairs of semi-detached dwellings of a uniform front building line. There are allotment gardens to the opposing side of the road and the site falls within designated countryside and strategic gap as set out in the Council's adopted Local Plan.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/04/50009	Construction of rear conservatory	PERMIT – 11/03/2004
F/07/60444	Construction of detached garden store with first floor storage area	PERMIT – 21/08/2007
F/09/64381	Two storey side extension and single storey front extension	REFUSE – 25/03/2009
F/10/66767	Single storey side and rear extension	PERMIT – 22/04/2010

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No objection.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Designated Countryside and Strategic Gap Outside 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 1.CO, 2.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 S9, DM1, DM24, DM26.
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

n/a

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site does not fall within a designated special policy area.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework:

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

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

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 the principle of the development proposed, layout and design, residential amenity, highway matters, and the impact of the proposals on the street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other – the comments of Hedge End Town Council are noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received	X	See below		
Other …				

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

There are no planning obligations requirements associated with this application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 2.CO states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would physically or visually diminish a strategic gap.

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

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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.

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle:

The site falls within designated countryside as set out in the adopted Local Plan, where there is a general presumption against residential development (Saved Policy 1.CO). Saved Policy 9.CO does, however, allow for the construction of domestic extensions to existing properties which conform to the criteria as specified above. The principle of an extension to the property is therefore considered to be acceptable subject to the exact details of that proposed being deemed to be appropriate and to accord with the requirements of all of the relevant development plan policies and associated supplementary planning guidance.

Layout, design and impact upon the character of the area:

Saved Policy 59.BE (i) of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011 requires that development takes full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and that it is appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting. In addition, Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stipulates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning (para 56).

A previous submission (F/09/64831) for a two-storey extension to the south-western side of the property was refused in March 2009 on the grounds of the impact of such a development upon the character of the street scene. Following on from this refusal, a single storey side extension was approved under application ref. F/10/66767 with this having subsequently been constructed. The present proposal seeks to build above this addition in order to again seek to provide for additional first floor accommodation in the form of a fourth bedroom and associated en-suite bathroom. Whilst the catslide design of the roof of the extension proposed is much lesser in terms of its bulk and massing than the aforementioned previously refused submission, the result is the introduction of what is a particularly awkward built form which appears both visually incongruous and unsympathetic to the host property and pays little regard to its present form and characteristics.

In addition to the visually discordant catslide roof form of the development, the proposals would also still result in what is a particularly high brick wall, being the south-eastern side elevation of the extension, being situated in close proximity to the boundary of the site with the highway. The combination of these factors when taken with the prominent corner siting of the application plot and the eminent visibility of the property within both West Road and Upper Northam Drive, is considered to result in what would be the introduction of a visually obtrusive and unduly prominent feature within these respective street scenes, to the significant detriment of their existing character.

For the reasons given therefore the application is considered to conflict with Saved Policy 59.BE (i)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

of the adopted Local Plan and Section 7 of 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 (para. 64).

Residential amenity:

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) requires that development avoids unduly impacting upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in particular by way of overbearing impact, loss of light or outlook, and overlooking. The development is fully screened from the adjoining dwelling, Abbots Leigh, by the application property itself and is positioned alongside the highway to the south-east (West Road). It is also a sited at a fairly notable distance from the nearest property to the rear, No. 1 West Road. As a result of this siting, it is considered that the development will not have any unacceptable impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties and no objections have been received in relation to the application in this regard. As such, there is deemed to be no conflict with the aforementioned policy requirements.

Highway matters:

Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles which includes an acceptable level of parking provision in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The proposals will increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling from 3 to a total of 4. In accordance with the standards as set out in the aforementioned SPD, 4-bedroom dwellings require the provision of 3 on-plot car parking spaces. The property presently has a single space to the front provided by way of a paved driveway, as well as a further space at the rear of the plot with gated access from West Drive. Whilst no additional parking provision is shown as part of the submission, there is room to the front to accommodate an additional space through the conversion of part of the property's front lawn area. Had the application been recommended for approval, it is considered that the requirement for the provision of this space could have been covered by way of a planning condition.

In the interests of clarity, it is noted that the Applicant has stated within Section 5 of the application form that some obstruction of the highway footpath alongside the property may occur during the construction phase of the development. Should the application have been approved and such a temporary disruption to the highway footpath be necessitated, this would be something that would require the separate consent of the Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council) outside of the planning process.

Conclusion:

Overall for the reasons as set out above, the development is on balance considered to conflict with the relevant development plan policies, associated supplementary planning documents, and national planning policy.

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

It is recommended that planning permission be refused.