HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/11/69404

DESCRIPTION	Raising of roof to provide first floor accommodation including 3No. Dormers to front and 3No. Dormers to rear and single storey rear extension (amended description)
ADDRESS	100 Pitmore Road, Eastleigh, SO50 4LW

SITE VISIT DATE	12.9.11, 23.9.11 (with Steve Nangreave), and 1.12.11
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes (following amended plans being received on 10.10.11)
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Application seeks permission for significant alterations and extensions to existing bungalow, including raising the roof, to create a 5-bed chalet style dwelling with front and rear dormer windows and raised decking/terraced area with timber cladding to the rear.
TOPOGRAPHY	The road slopes upwards in a north westerly direction. The site is relatively level to the front of the property however slopes with the road and also slopes downwards in a south westerly direction away from Pitmore Road with a sharp decline in levels from the middle to extreme rear of the site.
TREES	No trees will be affected by this application.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front boundary has an open appearance with low level 0.5-1.5m brick wall, hedging, and fencing, all with mature planting behind. The rear boundary is a mixture of chain link fencing, close boarded fencing, and breeze block wall ranging in height from 1.5-2.5+m and most of which has mature planting, trees, and hedging in front.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached, hipped roof bungalow with a single storey side and rear extension on a large plot, set back from the road by a front garden area. A driveway leads up the eastern boundary to a detached garage, shed, and large rear garden which drops off steeply from the middle of the site to the rear boundary.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Long, gentle curving, residential road composed mainly of detached bungalows but with some two storey housing, particularly towards the southern end. Many of the bungalows now have accommodation within the roof space lit by various arrangements of dormer windows. The site is situated on the west side where there is a greater variations in building design and size, and plots are generally wider.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/04/52126	Alterations to roof and single storey rear extension	Refused – Nov 2004 and subsequent appeal allowed, June 2005.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
95 Pitmore Road	Observation: plans for the front elevation appear to be very similar to the plans made by the previous owners (i.e. 3 dormer windows to the front) which we understood were turned down by Eastleigh Borough Council in 2004 and also lost on Appeal at a later date, stating that the design was " too bulky in appearance in relation to other property in the area".
98 Pitmore Road	Objection to original plans: • Plans are not accurate in relation to land levels (refers to previous appeal decision) • does not comply with the character area appraisal in that the proposal is out of keeping and does not follow building heights relative to the slope of the road • land contamination • parking issues on the site and surrounding area at present will be made worse by proposal • drainage – soakaway no-longer functions • existing garage subsided and unstable Objection to amended plans: • Question whether the application is valid and that the right notices have been served. • Conflicting information on the proposed materials • Not all revised plans made available on line • Description of the revised scheme not accurate on correspondence • Vary large raised platform area and no details of proposed materials of method of construction. • Raised decking will impede access to the garage • Rear extension materially different from application allowed at appeal and will allow overlooking into No.98 and No.102 • land contamination • Works to garage and decking area constructed behind the garage not shown on the plans.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Allbrook Parish Council	No response received.
Head of Environmental	I have reviewed the information provided with the application and the

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Health	additional information furnished by one of the neighbours with respect to an asbestos survey carried out at the above property. An asbestos survey was carried out in 2007 by ABP limited, which confirms the presence of asbestos bearing materials on the site, and which recommends that should any large scale projects be carried out on site in future that additional survey work should be undertaken. On this basis we advise that the application is conditioned to ensure adequate assessment is carried out, condition NS21 relating to dust and NS18 relating to no burning are imposed.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) Saved Policies: 59.BE
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Eastleigh Character Area – ELAC 2

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a special policy area.

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPS1	-	Delivering Sustainable Development

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies 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	x	
The environmental protection conditions suggested by the Head of Environmental Health have been noted and will be imposed as a “belt and braces” approach, given the history of the site, and as advised by the Head of Legal Services.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received		See below	x	
The plans have been reviewed by two officers and are considered accurate and that the appropriate				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

notices have been served, and correct plans made available for public consultation. Discrepancies in materials have been remedies through the use of an appropriately worded condition.

The planning history of the site is a material consideration, in particular the Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decision dated 27.06.2005 which allowed a similar development.

Land contamination issues noted but it is not within the remit of the planning system to remedy such issues. I have however consulted our Environmental Health Department, providing them with all documentation provided within the representation from No.98 Ptimore Road to ascertain their view on the proposed development and to seek their advice on any planning conditions that may be required. They are aware of the history of this site and have suggested several conditions, all of which will be imposed to ensure the proposed development does not worsen the current condition of the land. Legal advise has also been sought on the content of the objections from Mrs Richardson, including the court order to remove landfill. Legal have not highlighted any legal issues that should prevent a decision being made on this application.

The Planning system cannot control how many cars a household has and therefore if inconsiderate or dangerous parking continues to be an issue this should be reported to the Police. A condition has however been imposed to ensure that a minimum of 3 parking spaces are provided on site, in accordance with the requirements of the Residential Parking Standards SPD.

Drainage and underpinning is also not something within the remit of planning (at this scale) and is instead covered under building regulations and would be dealt with under this legislation.

The works to the garage are internal and do not require planning consent. The decking area constructed to the rear of the garage has now been removed and is not now relevant to this application.

All other matters are discussed within the assessment section of this report.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Planning Obligations are not required as a result of this proposal.

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.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Principle: The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principal of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below.

Design/Layout: The width and overall height of the proposal is the same as that permitted by appeal in 2005 and there have been no policy/legislative changes since that decision that would or should materially effect this application therefore the overall height and width of the main house is still considered acceptable (please also see street scene/character area considerations below in relation to the Character Area Appraisal which was adopted in January 2005). As detailed in the 2005 appeal decision the proposed building is certainly larger and significantly more bulky than the adjoining bungalows. However, it would not look out of place in this part of the road where there are already substantial variations in dwelling designs. The plot is considered sufficiently wide to absorb a building of this size without it appearing unduly cramped.

The application now includes a rear extension, which through discussions with the applicant and agent has been reduced from two storey to a single storey flat roof extension with roof lanterns, 2x additional rear dormer windows, and a raised decking/terraced area. These amendments were sought due to concerns over the bulk of the rear extension, its resultant impacts on the amenities of No.102 Pitmore Road and that the plans did not show means of access and egress from the development. The overall layout and size of the proposal is now considered acceptable.

The design of the proposal is also considered acceptable and an overall improvement on the physical appearance of the existing property. It is acknowledged that the roof design has altered (raised eaves and lowered pitch) from that previously permitted however although having a slightly bulkier appearance, the materials are an improvement on those previously permitted – the proposed clay tiles will look attractive with the low eaves and cat slide style roof over the front porch. A condition has however been suggested for details and samples of materials to be submitted and approved to ensure the LPA has control and influence over the materials used.

It is noted that the front dormer windows are smaller and are positioned slightly lower on the roof than those at the back. This helps to maintain a balanced frontage of windows and to ensure that the windows do not dominate the roof plane when viewed from the street scene. The windows to the rear are larger and as a result slightly higher however they still maintain a balanced rear elevation which is aesthetically pleasing.

The proposed raised decking/terrace area is large and spans the entire rear elevation of the house. This area is necessary to enable access and egress from the proposed development and to make up the difference in land revels between the garden and the rear doors. The decking is clad in timber with timer balustrade, which will weather and will blend in with the surrounding landscape. It is noted that the decking area is raised and sits just below the eaves of the garage however it does not prevent or restrict access to the driveway or garage area and is therefore considered acceptable.

Street Scene/Character of the area: Eastleigh Character Area 2 covers Pitmore Road and includes the site. It is noted that the Character Area appraisal came into affect after the appeal decision and recognises and encourages that the predominant orientation of the ridgeline is maintained relative to the slope. The proposed development obviously considerably alters the design of the roof however the orientation of the roof remains the same being hipped and running parallel to the road. The character appraisal also refers to maintaining the uniformity of the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

building heights of buildings but this specifically refers to the north east side of the road. The proposed development is on the south-west side of the road and therefore this guidance is not relevant. The proposal maintains the existing build line and boundary treatments, does not obscure views of the hills to the south and retains the grass verges and is therefore considered to comply in all ways to the guidance contained within the Character Area Appraisal.

Although it is acknowledged that the appearance of property will be substantially altered it is considered that the proposal will improve the appearance of the property within the street scene (also see design/layout considerations above). Pitmore Road has a mixture of types and designs of housing and other examples of similar conversions can be seen within Pitmore Road which demonstrates that they sit comfortably within the street and do not have a detrimental impact on the street scene or the wider character of the area.

Residential Amenity: Due to the relationship, orientation and spacing between the application property and its neighbors, there are not considered to be any negative impacts upon the amenity currently enjoyed by neighboring properties.

The new windows on the first floor face front and back and not directly onto neighboring land. They will inevitably allow opportunities for an element of overlooking into neighboring gardens however using 45degree visibility splays, any views will be focused towards the rear of neighboring gardens, where the views are not obstructed by boundary structures and screening. This view is supported by the 2005 appeal decision which goes on further to state that “all first floor windows face towards the front or rear and not towards No.98 from which the new house would be separated by the width of the existing driveway. The rear bedroom windows would allow angled views of parts of the rear garden of No.98 however such views from first floor bedroom windows of adjoining rear gardens are a commom feature of urban development and do not give rise to undue loss of provicy, mainly because bedrooms and gardens are normally in use at different times of the day”.

The proposed doors and windows in the single storey extension are not considered result in undue overlooking due to the separation between this element of the proposal and No.102 and the structures along the boundary which obstruct any clear views. Likewise, the proposed raised decking/terrace area is not considered to result in any material loss of privacy due to the separation of properties coupled with No.98 being on higher ground where views are not possible and the screening/structures along the boundary of No.102.

The proposal is not considered to be overbearing. The spacing between the proposal and No.98, who are on lower ground, coupled with the structures that run along No.98’s boundary mean that any direct views of the proposal are obscured and vice versa. The proposal does come closer to No.102 and will be a higher structure however due to land levels and the spacing between properties will not appear overbearing.

Having carried out the daylight and sunlight tests contained with the Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh SPG, the proposal is not considered to result in any detrimental or material loss of light. Due to the orientation of the buildings, the enlarged property may result in an element of shadowing onto No.102 in the morning however as the sun progresses from East to west the overshadowing will reduce, if not disappear.

Car Parking: Our Residential Parking Standards SPD requires 3 spaces for a 4+ bedroom dwellings. The site is capable of accommodating the required spaces and a condition has been

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

added to ensure these are provided on the site and retained. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with parking standards.

Land Contamination: Legal Services and Environmental Health are aware of the land contamination issues on the site and it is noted that there has been a sustained and ongoing neighbor dispute with regard to land contamination. It is not within the remit of the planning system to remedy such issues, more the court order between the land owners, however a condition aimed at minimising the risk of pollution and to ensure the site is satisfactorily decontaminated as a direct result of the proposed development is recommended. With the use of this condition the proposed development is not considered to have any negative impacts on land contamination.

Other matters: The site is not within a Flood Zone and therefore there are no specific drainage requirements for this site.

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

The temporary shed shown on the plan is only needed during the construction of the proposed development and is not considered appropriately sited for permanent retention. A condition is therefore recommended to ensure its removal of this shed within 12 months of the date of the planning permission.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above this application is considered to comply with Policy 59.BE and the guidance contained within the above mentioned SPD and SPG and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.