HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/74111

DESCRIPTION	Formation of new roof to form first floor with front and rear dormer window, alteration to elevations and reconfiguration of raised patio area to rear
ADDRESS	Greensleeves, Hungerford, Bursledon

SITE VISIT DATE	06/05/14
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	This application seeks approval to raise the ridge of the existing bungalow by 1.2m to create first floor accommodation facilitated by front and rear dormers and the addition of a small canopy addition over the reconfigured patio area including new steps and removal of the existing decking. The front porch is also increased in size and the elevations of the property rendered and timber cladded.
TOPOGRAPHY	Land slopes steeply to the west (rear)
TREES	None affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Boundary wall to the front, in and out driveway. Close boarded fencing along boundary with Birch Spinney and Aspley and various outbuildings and lower wooden fencing with Aspley towards the rear. Low level picket fencing and mature trees to rear boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site accommodates a detached bungalow set in a very large plot which is separated to the rear by a stream. There is an existing garage to the side and frontage parking.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential, characterised by a mix of detached and semi detached properties.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/24939/001/00	SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS	Per 17/12/1990

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Keith Jones Sleepy Hollow Hungerford Bursledon	Object Comment: I would like to raise the following concerns. We note that the design statement focuses on the adjacent buildings which are not impacted by the raised height whereas the neighbours opposite are neither consulted nor addressed in the planning documents. There will be an obstruction to the views currently enjoyed from Sleepy hollow towards the woodland beyond Greensleeves.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	We note reference is made the precedence set by the house next door but one. In all cases that we can observe the additional storey is accommodated by raising the ridge but not the eaves. The significant increase in eave height is out of character with the precedence set with the rest of the nearby dwellings. Eave heights remain low and dormers are set into the roof. This results in a slight reduction of upstairs area but considering the amount of space gained elsewhere this is minimal. It would also be possible to raise the rear elevation full height where there is no impact on neighbours. The house as shown on the plan looks slab sided with a proportionally very small roof. This accentuated the effect of the metal cladding applied to the very large dormer. We would be grateful for a further review taking into account the comments above and consideration given to the houses opposite which take the greatest impact of the proposed changes.	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Bursledon Parish Council	18/03/14 – No objection
Biodiversity Officer	<u>Nature Conservation</u> **Bats** I note from the survey that a bat roost has been found under the overhanging tiles of the south facing wall and therefore a licence will need to be acquired once planning permission has been obtained. I understand from the biodiversity officer's comment and the report that further emergence surveys will be required prior to submission of the application for a European Protected Species licence. This survey should be carried out to ascertain both the size of the known bat roost and whether further bat roosts are present. Under the Habitats Regulations, three derogation tests need to be met before an action can be permitted that will involve the destruction of a bat roost (and a derogation licence granted by Natural England to prevent an offence being committed): There must be an imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment; There must be no satisfactory alternative; The proposed action must not be detrimental to the maintenance of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range. Current Natural England standing advice is that local planning authorities should only give planning consent for a proposal that involves the

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	destruction of a bat roost if it considers it likely that a derogation licence will be issued. In practice, this can only be done by considering if the three tests can be met. I feel that taking into consideration the proposed mitigation of replacement habitat and additional bat roosting opportunities it is unlikely that Natural England will refuse the protected species licence and a case can be made that the three tests above have been satisfied. I therefore have no objection to the proposed development. Could an informative be placed on any permission granted reminding the applicant of the need to undertake further emergence surveys and obtain a European Protected Species licence from Natural England before construction commences.
Conservation Architect	Pre-app comments: This is an elegant design proposal to refurbish a 1960's bungalow that is showing it's age. A precedent has already been set by the next but one bungalow to the north with I would guess approximately the same rise in ridge height. The unfortunate effect of this will be to diminish a little the bungalow in between but the modern design will be a lift to the area and probably offset this effect. In height terms this will continue the rhythm along the street frontage of bungalows alternating with one and a half storey dwellings. The palette of materials while obviously unresolved at present appears to be zinc roofing to the original bungalow with rendered walls and maybe weatherboarding to the south elevation. The roof to the rear extension does not appear to be resolved yet - is this to be changed from the existing? Comments on current application: Answer pretty much as before really but this revised scheme is less radical than that originally proposed one and the natural slate enables the proposal to be more in keeping with the other buildings about together and the metal faced dormers give a modern twist to the roofscape while retaining a traditional colour, it would appear.
Engineers	The in/out driveway allows for forward gear access an egress, and adequate on-site parking. The proposed garage (in addition to this parking) also provides a suitable space for cycle storage. **DC Engineer:** Eric Reed **DC Engineer Comments:** Conditions D03, E04
Environment Agency	Environment Agency Position We have no objection to this application as submitted but would like to provide the following advice: Advice to Local Planning Authority

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	The site does partially fall within flood zone 3 which has the highest probability of flooding. The chance of flooding in any one year is greater than or equal to 1% (i.e. a 100 to 1 chance) for river flooding. Due to this a Flood Risk Assessment should have been submitted with this application however we do not assess that any of the proposed works will increase flood risk and therefore have no objection.
Old Bursledon Action Group	No response received
Esso	No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Local Gap Within Countryside Within Special Policy Area Adjacent to Conservation Area

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 25.NC 59.BE, 169.LB, 179.LB,1.CO, 3.CO, 9.CO
Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 S9, DM1, DM9, DM10, DM26
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

N/A

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Bursledon Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 58 and 64

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		
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received	X	See below		

Neighbour letters were sent to properties opposite the development site including Sleepy Hollow. The protection of private views is not a material planning consideration. The Boroughs Conservation Architect has raised no objection with regards to the materials proposed to be used on the development by our Conservation Architect. A condition will be recommended to ensure that samples of materials are submitted for consideration and approval.

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.

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 meets other criteria within the Local Plan.

Policy 3.CO aims to visually and physically protect the Local Gap with development only permitted if it cannot be located elsewhere or will not diminish the Local Gap.

Policy 9.CO relates to extensions to existing dwellings and requires that the following criteria are met:

- the dwelling is not subject to an agricultural occupancy condition;
- the development is not likely to facilitate the subdivision of the property into more than one dwelling;
- the extension does not result in the dwelling becoming 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.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Policy 25.NC seeks the protection of habitats.

Policy 179.LB states that further development within the Old Bursledon Special will be refused with the exception of replacement dwellings, appropriate extensions or changes of use, provided that these respect and enhance the character of the Special Policy Area. The pre-text to this policy, paragraph 11.29, states that ''…extensions to existing buildings…are not precluded, provided that they are not detrimental to the character of the area…''

S9 – Presumption against new development subject to consideration of other policies and identification of countryside gap. Permission will be granted for development related to (ii) residential extensions (Policy DM26) but not for development in countryside gaps that will physically or visually diminish the gap or have an urbanising effect detrimental to the openness of the gap, the character of the countryside or separate identities of the adjoining settlements. In permitting development in the countryside, the council will seek wherever possible to (a) avoid impacts on rural character, intrinsic character of the landscape and biodiversity of the area; (b) secure long-term beneficial management practices that will enhance the landscape and biodiversity of the countryside.

Policy DM1 largely echo's the criteria of Policy 59.BE.

DM9 – seeks the protection of habitats.

Policy DM10 requires that development achieves a high standard of design.

DM26 – allows the extension of existing dwellings in the countryside provided (i) the extension is not disproportionate to neighbouring properties or its plot.

Policy BU7 states that residential extensions in the Old Bursledon Special Policy Area will be permitted provided they have do not exceed a max. increase in volume of 25% of the property post 1982 (from designation of SPA) have regard to the impact of the development on the space between buildings and the openness of the area, ensuring that the character of the undeveloped landscape between buildings is conserved and enhanced; are subservient to and in proportion to the existing building in form, scale and design; do not contribute to the cumulative urbanisation of the area; and are not otherwise detrimental to the character of the area as viewed from the River Hamble. The pre-text supporting this policy, paragraph 6.4.37, states that ''…extensions and replacement of existing buildings are permitted where these do not detract from the character of the area.''

The area immediately surrounding the application site is made up by a mix of small bungalows, 1.5 storey properties and full two storey housing. The application site lies between single storey bungalows, although there is a larger 1.5 storey adjacent to one of the neighbouring bungalows at Hollydene House which is clearly read within the streetscene.

The proposals consist of raising the roof of the front section of the property by 1.2m to allow the provision of front and rear facing dormer windows to enable 1st floor accommodation. There is a single storey canopy proposed to the rear over the existing patio area. The patio area is to be reconfigured by way of removing the existing decking, reducing and relocating the patio steps, removing the patio door projection and enclosing the area with a wall. The front porch would project by approx.1.9m to a height of 2.8m.

The site is within the Old Bursledon SPA but outside of the conservation area. The dwelling was extended in 1990 to the rear, which together with the proposed raising of the roof and addition of dormer windows will result in the volume of the original dwelling (pre-1982) being increased in total by 143%. This is significantly over the emerging policy BU7 which proposes a limit of 25% increase in volume.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

However, the proposed physical increase externally is not significant with a modest increase in ridge height (1.2m) enabling the addiotnal volume to be delivered. The scale of the development respects the existing bungalow and remains smaller than a number of properties within Hungerford Bottom. The contemporary design would enhance the contribution to the dwelling makes to the SPA compared to the existing bungalow. Overall the scheme is not considered to undermine the character of the area or the qualities of the SPA.

Recently, an Inspector in dismissing an extension that increase the size of a cottage in Station Road by 243% felt the scale of the physical additions were not ancillary or sympathetic to the existing cottage, whilst also commenting that limited weight in his opinion could be given to the emerging policy BU7 as it had not been submitted for examination.

The alterations and extensions are therefore considered to represent sympathetic additions to the existing property and ones that do not detract from the character and appearance of the immediate area. The increase to the built form to the front of the property (by way of a height increase of 1.2m and dormer windows) is not considered to be excessive and the property is not considered to result in a visually prominent feature within the streetscene, to its detriment. The existing appearance of the streetscene is characterised by a mix of house types and styles, so the construction of a higher property amongst 2no. bungalows would not be out of keeping especially as there is adequate spacing (8m at closest point) between properties.

The neighbouring bungalows sit relatively in line with the application site and as stated have adequate spacing between them. Due to the extent of the alterations, largely to the main section of roof of the bungalow going up in height and not projecting further to the sides of the property, then no loss of light or outlook is considered to neighbouring properties. No windows to the side elevations are proposed to warrant any overlooking to neighbouring properties. The alterations to the rear of the property would be contained within the existing patio area. The new wall to surround the patio area is not considered to be excessive in height and the nearest neighbour to the rear is approx. 9m.

The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

On this basis the development is considered to be subservient and in proportion to the existing building in form, scale and design and would therefore preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the special policy area.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. 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

Recommend approval, subject to conditions.