MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. C/10/68017

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Single storey side & rear & first floor rear extensions to provide additional accommodation Hollybank 41 Winchester Street Botley Southampton SO30 2EB

SITE VISIT DATE	10 Nov 2010			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Extensions to provide 6 additional bedrooms, bathroom and lounge area with landscaping to provide a sensory garden. The parking arrangements to the front are to be altered.			
SITE AREA	NA			
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	NA			
TOPOGRAPHY	X	Level	But set slightly higher than the highway	
TREES		No	X	Yes, to the rear of the site is a large oak tree
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	A mix of 1.4m high walls, 1.8m high fencing and 3m high conifers hedging			
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Large detached former dwelling with attractive detailing at eaves. Extended to the side and rear in the past it has now been converted to a nursing home. The rear single storey extension (lounge) is sat approx. 0.4m above the garden level. Good hedging around the boundaries offering an attractive outlook for residents. The nursing home accommodates 17 residents in 14 rooms with 6 staff. The proposal will increase this to 23 residents in 20 rooms with one additional member of staff.			
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Predominantly residential and within a conservation area. To the northwest are bungalows, whilst to the southeast are old detached/terraced cottages.			

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
C/10/66568	Single storey side & rear extensions & 2 storey rear extension to rest home	Wdn March 2010
Z/16019/005/00	Two storey and single storey rear extensions and construction of car park to rest home	Permitted 1989
Z/16019/004/00	Two storey rear extension and two storey side extension (amended plans)	Refused 1989

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/16019/003/00	Two storey rear extension to rest home	Refused 1989
Z/16019/002/00	Change of use from single dwelling to rest home	Permitted 1988

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Mrs Collett 9 Alexandra Way	Object. Have not addressed concerns previously raised.
Clare Chandler 3 Alexandra Way	Object. Inadequate drainage at present, loss of privacy, development close to property, noise from kitchens, car parking, residents and use of garden, over development, inadequate car parking, inadequate visibility splays
Mrs Haste 5 Alexandra Way	Object. Noise disturbance from existing use of the site, loss of privacy, loss of sunlight, previous extension was not built in same position as permitted.
Mrs Smith 7 Alexandra Way	Object. Noise disturbance from existing use of the site, loss of privacy, loss of sunlight, lack of car parking
Mrs Kurth 39 Winchester Street	Object. Loss of privacy, loss of light, drainage concerns, inhibits maintenance of garden wall, may increasing rising damp experienced, inadequate parking, not appropriate to conservation area.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Head of Environmental Health	No objection subject to amenity condition – hours, burning
West End PC	Object – over development, impact on conservation area, lack of car parking, lack of parking for delivery vehicles, drainage concerns, traffic impact assessment requested.
Head of Transportation and Engineering	No objection. Original concerns regarding lack of car parking have been addressed with amended plans. Contributions to sustainable transport measures are required.
Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy	No objection. Proposal fits well with main building and careful choice of materials will assist further. A lot of the ground floor accommodation is hidden by boundary hedges.
Tree officer	No objection subject to protective fencing being used during construction.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE

POLICY CONTEXT

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

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

South East Plan
Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 28.BE, 45.Es (drainage), 59.BE (Development Criteria), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T. (Parking), 191.IN (infrastructure)
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh
Supplementary Planning Guidance:Storage and Collection of Domestic Waste & Recyclable Materials
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPG - 13 Transport
PPS - 1 Delivering Sustainability
- 1 Planning and Climate Change Supplement
- 3 Housing
- 5 Planning & The Historic Environment.

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, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

X	See below		Other…….

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	See below		Other…….

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of Circular 05/05 and policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Sustainable Transport ion accordance with the advice of the Head of Transportation and Engineering. The applicant has agreed to secure the contributions through a direct payment for which a Section 106 Legal Agreement receipt has been issued.

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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

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 169.LB requires development to protect or enhance conservation areas, and to be appropriate in design, scale and materials.

The principle of extending is acceptable provided the development is acceptable subject to these two main policies.

Layout and design

The single storey extension extends the existing rear extension by 6m (1.5m shorter than previous app) but wraps round towards the fence with no.37 and 39 Winchester St, to be within 2m of it. The shape of the extension follows the narrowing nature of the site, as well as the dog-leg in the southern boundary, allowing sufficient space for landscaping to be retained and strengthened. The garden is to be opened up and landscaped to deliver a useful and worthwhile area for residents to use and observe. The part of the existing pitched roof over the rear extension is to be removed, reducing the height and visual impact of the development as well as allowing a neat tie-in with the proposed extension. Locating the access ramp to the south of the development assists in reducing potential for over looking adjoining dwellings in Alexandra Way.

At first floor, the extension adds 8m to the depth of the building and results in it being 2.5m closer to the northern boundary. As set out below, this is not unreasonable and would not harm residential amenity. The materials are to match the existing with the use of tile hanging, white timber windows and matching roof tiles.

Street scene and character of the area

The design respects the host dwelling both in its scale and form. The extensions are subservient and draw on the materials used on the existing building. The development has no impact on the street scene, although glimpses would be achievable between properties in Alexandra Way.

Residential amenity

To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh has been produced which gives guidance on over looking, loss of light and amenity space for new dwellings.

The extensions would be visible from gardens and rear facing windows or neighbouring properties, but are sufficient distance away not to cause demonstrable harm to outlook, light or privacy of the existing properties. The closest part of the first floor extension is 18m from the rear of no.3 Alexandra Way and the new side facing bedroom windows is 22.5m, which exceeds the 12m and 22m acceptable distances set out in the SPG.

The rear facing first floor windows have been designed with deep cills to minimise the potential for residents to stand and overlook the gardens of the Alexandra Way properties. At an oblique angle these windows are 23m from the rear of no.5 and when a more direct line of site is gained this distance to no.7 has increased to 27m.

The retention and enhancement of the boundary landscaping, relocation of the access ramp together with the reduction in size of the single storey extension (compared to previous scheme)

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

further minimise the impact to an acceptable level.

New windows within the south side of the existing building would have overlooked the garden of no.39. Amended plans have been secured to obscure these windows, and a condition is recommended accordingly. The existing wall and vegetation will be retained to ensure the single storey extension is not visually dominant.

The outlook for residents on the south side is not brilliant, but best endeavours have minimised direct views onto the boundary wherever possible.

Highway matters

Policy 100.T expects development to be sited close to, or well served by, public transport, cycling and walking. Policy 104.T states permission will only be granted for development that provides adequate off-highway parking provision.

The site enjoys an entrance and an exit on to Winchester Street with some frontage parking and the ability to use the gravel area to the side of the building (although this is not currently used). Currently, parking is inadequate it seems and fails to meets its own needs with on road parking being experienced. HCC standards would require 10 spaces and amended plans have been secured to deliver this, increasing the proposed parking from 8no. spaces to 10. The arrangements allow for cars to enter, turn and exit safely, with staff parking predominately being to the rear of the site leaving the frontage parking for visitors. There is sufficient space for delivery vehicles to pull of the road should they desire.

A traffic assessment would be an unreasonable request in the light of meeting parking standards and in the absence of an objection from the Head of Transportation and Engineering.

Cycle parking is provided within the staff area, full details of which are to be secured via condition.

Trees

The development would not impact on trees within or adjacent to the site. All trees are to be retained, including the leylandii hedging plated along the rear of Alexandra Way. The Oak tree in the garden is to be retained and included within the overall landscaping of the sensory garden rather than being fenced off as is the case at present.

Nature conservation

There are no identified features of nature conservation or protected species within the site.

Drainage

Policies 59.BE, 45.ES and 190.IN require development to provide or be able to connect to adequate drainage infrastructure, for both foul and surface water drainage. There is anecdotal evidence of surcharging within Botley and of neighbouring properties experiencing surface water flooding in certain areas of the gardens. To address this, a report has been provided detailing the partial discharge of surface water into the foul drainage system as well as the use of soakaways within the garden. The report concludes that a technical solution is available to prevent additional flooding or surcharging through the removal of surface water from the foul drainage system and the use of soakaways or an attenuation chamber. This would seem a reasonable solution but additional detailed information of the proposed drainage is required, and condition has been added to secure this.

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.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to permit