HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/78000

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension
ADDRESS	Windways 159 Satchell Lane Hamble-Le-Rice Southampton SO31 4HP

SITE VISIT	Yes
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	One and a half storey side extension with pitched roof to match that of the existing property. Proposal includes front pitched roof dormer window and rear juliet balcony. The upper floor will be used as a bedroom with en-suite and the ground floor is used as a garage. The extension measures 3.3m(w) by 7.9m(d) by 6.7m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	Gentle rise from Satchell Lane towards the house and then levels out at rear.
TREES	Some small trees at front and rear, none of covered by a TPO or of high amenity value.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open at front, high hedging on both side and around rear garden.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey chalet house with small pitched roof dormer windows at front and long flat roof dormer at rear. There is a gap at the side of the property which is used for car parking with a garage to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area, consisting of large detached properties of varying styles set in spacious verdant plots.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/15/76213	Construction of two storey side extension	Refused 12/5/15 Dismissed on appeal
F/12/70915	Construction of first floor and two storey side extension with 1no. front dormer	Permit August 2012
Z/14156/001	First floor extension and reciting of garage.	Permit August 1983

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
1 letter of objection (161 Satchell Lane)	We recognise the new proposal is aesthetically more pleasing and creates a more symmetrical frontage to Satchell Lane. However, as our property faces south with 3 bedrooms, kitchen/diner, lounge, balcony and patio / pool area all

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	directly looking towards this proposed extension it has a huge bearing on our outlook (photo provided). We note that his extension is slightly larger than the previous extension built the opposite end of the property. We previously expressed concerns about the impact on the significant hedge planted on our side of the boundary between the two houses and the feasibility of the scheme fitting in the available space combined with the loss of sunlight over our garden and in particular the swimming pool which relies on solar heating. These concerns remain despite the revised scheme moving the building line. The new plan suggests there is space for a passage to the right of the property and we would be delighted if this were to be the case to allow access to attend the hedge. We doubt, bearing in mind that the boundary post to the side of their garage is only 40cm away from the building, that this will be practical. We note that the site plans (drawing 12 carried over from the previous application) still incorrectly represent the boundary / hedge position and the boundary line appears to be drawn to our wall rather than our boundary (which actually ranges from 1m to 1.4m beyond our wall. We note that the applicant has suggested there will be no need to prune the hedge but are aware that the hedge does overhang the boundary line in several places (sometimes up to 0.5 metre). We would also seek reassurance with the building being so close that - 1. Bathroom dormer would be etched/frosted glass as it will overlook our garden 2. The currently unsightly satellite dish and lose wiring is repositioned elsewhere on the property 3. The alarm is re-sighted to improve its visibility from the road 4. No lights that shine into our property are placed on the northern elevation wall 5. The ground floor window for the garage on the North elevation is low enough (or uses frosted glass) not to be visible over our wall in case the hedge does not survive the building work. 6. There is clarification on the distance between the new building line (including any potential overhangs) and the actual boundary line between the two properties.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hamble Parish Council	No response

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: 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014: DM1 (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising:

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

- 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 Document: Quality Places & Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area – BHH 32

Strength of Character - Moderate

- Retain the soft verges and supplement with additional planting in order to maintain the 'lane' character.
- Retain and extend the continuity in building line at the southern end of Satchell Lane.

Maintain the predominant deep building setbacks in order to retain/reinforce the existing levels of on-plot planting.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

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		See below	X	

- The proposals impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residents shall be discussed in the assessment section. However, it should be noted that the daylight standards only apply to windows in habitable rooms and swimming pools/ outbuildings and lower gardens are not afforded the same level of protection.
- Relocating the satellite dish/ alarm & maintenance of the hedge are not material planning considerations and domestic lighting does not require planning approval.
- The proposed extension is set 1.7m in from the line marked existing boundary (to the north) and although there maybe some dispute about the precise boundary line the proposal is set far enough into the site so it is unlikely to encroach on the neighboring property. A note about encroachment will be attached to the decision notice.

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.

Character and Appearance

The proposal is a resubmission of a previously refused two storey side extension (F/15/76213), the extension being later dismissed on appeal. There were two aspects of concern with the previous scheme, firstly the design quality of the proposed extension and its relationship to the existing dwelling, and secondly the loss of space at the northern flank caused as a result of the development.

In terms of the design, the proposal removes the awkward front gable in favour of a smaller dormer window and the car port has been changed to a garage. The proposals roof shape and dormer window follows the form of the existing dwelling and is a significant improvement on the previous scheme.

However, in terms of a loss of open space at the northern boundary there is no material difference between the proposal and the previously refused scheme. The proposal is still at a two storey level and is only marginally narrower, the proposal being 3.3m wide compared to the 3.8m width of the previous application. As such the proposal is considered to result in unacceptable loss of open space to the side of the dwelling, which combined with the space lost to the previous two storey extension, means that the dwelling will extend almost the full width of the plot. The proposal therefore fails to address the second part of the reason for refusal and so would be contrary to local and national planning policies.

On this point the Planning Inspector stated *"The further extension to the edge of the site ... with the loss of open space to the side and encroachment towards the hedge would result in a perception of a dwelling too large for its plot (para 7)."* Furthermore, *"on this site and in a semi rural location the extension would be out of keeping and together with the loss of openness and views past the building to the rear, the effect would be one of a cramped development relative to its plot. I consider that the two storey extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area (para 8)."*

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

In coming to this conclusion, the Inspector acknowledged that other dwellings in the locality had built across the full width of their site. However, he concluded that some of the buildings were of a different design and/ or had single storey elements so the loss of space was more acceptable. In other cases, the extension allowed across the full width of the plot does in fact cause the harmful effect that would occur at Windways should the proposed extension be allowed.

Residential Amenity

The comments made by the neighbouring residents have been carefully considered, particularly in reference to the impact on the rear kitchen/diner, lounge and three bedroom windows in no.161. However, as these windows are around 20m away from the edge of the extension it is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on their residential amenity by way of a loss of light, outlook or overbearing impact. The proposed extension does not include any first floor side windows and the ground floor window serves a garage, which is not a primary habitable room and will mostly be obscured by the hedge. As such the proposal is not considered to create an unacceptable level of overlooking into the neighbouring dwelling.

Other Considerations

- The site is able to provide the required level of onsite car parking (as set out within Residential Parking Standards SPD) and will retain a good sized garden. As such the application will not result in an overdevelopment of the plot.
- The proposal is for a householder development and is of a size that 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 not required for this development, which will fall inside the designated zone of impact.

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

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

Recommend Refuse