HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/78850

DESCRIPTION ADDRESS	Single storey rear extension & two storey side extension with flat roof dormer window 18 Sherborne Way Hedge End Southampton SO30 0JN

SITE VISIT DATE	02/08/2016
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	It is considered that sufficient detailed information has been provided to allow this assessment.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks permission for two extensions. Two storey side extension. 7.0m(d) x 3.0m(w) mono pitch to 5.01m (h). Mono pitched roof to incorporate a dormer contained with the confines of the roof 1.75m(h) x 6.2m(d) projecting 2.1m. This is designed to provide a garage at ground with access doors at the back. Dormer to incorporate two large, sideward facing, windows. Single storey rear extension. 5.6m (w) x 3.0m(d) with a maximum mono pitch to 3.6m(h). Windowless flank but full with bifold doors leading onto the rear garden.
TOPOGRAPHY	The front garden and land upon which the host property has been constructed are predominantly flat and level. Rear gardens of both semi-detached properties, the application site and No20, are set below and slope down to the south.
TREES	There will be no trees affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	A combination of boundary treatments. A 2.0m high close boarded wooden fencing between No20 and the application site. A 2.0m high brick wall dividing the west side of the garden with the verge along Prestwood Road.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application relates to a two storey semi-detached residential property on the southern side of Sherbourne Way and junction with Prestwood Road.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Predominantly a mix of two storey terraced and semi-detached residential properties of the same design and date. Distinctive showing flank wall first floor landing windows to

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	many properties.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Objection No1	• Loss of sun light to conservatory. • Concerned over the proposed roof of rear extension adding to loss of light. • Like to suggest an alternative flat roof.
Objection No2	• Object to design of the side extension. • Not in keeping with property or locality. • A poor design without a forward facing window. • Access to the WC seems to be the only link with the existing house. • The overall design is very different from other properties. • Potential use as another dwelling. • Parking problems. • Enclose the junction. • New fence. • No access to new garage shown.
Objection No3	• Front elevation brick wall is out of keeping. • No access to main house. • Dormer is not in keeping. • Potential use of side extension. • Parking on Prestwood and Sherbourne Road. • Erection of new fence and loss of open land.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No reply
Transport and Engineering	No Objection – however are concerned over the use of the single garage with a stair within. No elevational drawing show stair heights. Property will remain as 3-bed two car parking spaces are required. Any independent dwelling requires condition C04.

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 policies

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

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
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area HEWEB 32

- Retain the grass verges.
- Maintain the predominant plot widths and continuity in building line.
- Maintain the predominant open frontages while seeking to maintain a clear distinction between public and private space.

The proposal does not comply with this criteria, continuity in building line, distinction between public and private space.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

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		See below		
Environment Agency – Reference to flood zone 2 and 3 – standard reply to safeguard the levels.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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.

Principal of development of the site.
The application site lies within an established residential area where the principal of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependent on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable.

The proposals impact on the street scene and the character of the area.

Single storey rear.
Notwithstanding notification objection, in terms of residential amenity the overall height, width and depth of the proposed rear extension is considered acceptable within normal permitted development guidelines.

Character Appraisal.
The proposal does not respect the Character Appraisal for this area of Hedge End.

The Appraisal identifies the need to maintain grass verges, maintain prominent plot widths, open frontages and the distinction between private and public open space.

Whilst the single storey rear extension is contained within definable rear garden/amenity space the two storey side element would be located on open and prominent land to the side of the host property.

In addition the introduction of a low level dormer on a single storey garage would represent a departure from the design norm in the locality and an incongruous feature to the existing street scene. The proposal presents a poor design in a prominent corner location.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Side extension.
Pre application advice (Q/16/78064) gave similar considered advice that also stated, the proposal would detract from the overall design, in such a prominent corner position, be not in keeping with the area, adversely remove soft landscaping that enhances the locality, remove a grass area beside the verge and would be overbearing and dominant addition to the street scene.

Pre application advice has been ignored with the submission of this scheme.

In addition the large proposed dormer within the garage roof is not considered a good design and would dominate the roof space of the proposed garage. The proposed dormer window is therefore considered to be unacceptable in terms of scale, form and design and would impact on the street scene and character of the area. Pre application advice goes on to state that the garage and associated dormer be removed from any scheme and that open grassland be maintained.

The proposal is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with policy 59:BE of Eastleigh Borough Council's Local Plan.

The pre application advice has been ignored and a very similar scheme submitted for approval with this application.

Permitted Development Rights.
Rights have been removed WIR/12825/000 in 1966 to potentially safeguard development such as this.

New close boarded wooden fencing.
Despite the land to the side of No18 being within the ownership of the property, to the rear of No18 an original 2.0m high brick wall encloses the rear garden, delineating the intended extent of the garden and private with public amenity to safeguarding the open nature of the land at the side of the property.

Part 2 Class A.1(a) (ii) and (b), of the permitted development order 2015 determines a 1m and 2m height rule. The introduction of recent 2.0m high fencing adjacent to the highway does not comply with, the removal of or compliance with PD rights in addition to Eastleigh Borough Council Character Appraisal for this arear of Hedge End. The new fencing has not been included within this current application. In relation to this fencing, given the policy context explained above, any future application is unlikely to gain favour.

The impact on the residential amenity of the present and future occupants of the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings.

Objection has been received from local residents that details the unacceptable design in terms of the open land and design of properties in the neighborhood. This is in accord with assessment and Eastleigh Borough Councils Plan Policy 59:BE

There are several examples of single store side extensions in the area that have been approved, respect and are considered acceptable, due to mass, bulk, enclosure, shadowing within the street scene. The proposal does not comply with the points outlined in the national policy framework identified, within the national policy framework guidance, above.

Nature conservation
The proposal is/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/was not required for this development as it falls outside/inside the designated zone of impact.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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

Refuse.