HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/74357

DESCRIPTION	First floor side extension, front porch and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing porch, single storey side extension and conservatory
ADDRESS	29 Merdon Avenue Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 1EQ

SITE VISIT DATE	16/05/14
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above, two storey side extension, 8.5m long, 5.6m deep in location of existing single storey, flat roof extension. Extension incorporates two front and two rear-facing dormers, one with Juliette balcony. Single storey rear extension, flat roof with glass lantern, 9.6m wide x 5.9m deep, with small single storey extension with lean-to roof adjacent, 2.6m wide x 4.0m deep. Front porch with hipped roof and gable above door, 6.0m x 1.6-2.0m.
TOPOGRAPHY	Site slopes up from the road towards the front of the property. Rear garden is generally flat.
TREES	None affected by this application.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Planting/fencing along all boundaries.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Large, detached dwelling with single storey double garage, single storey flat roof side extension and rear conservatory. Dwelling is set well back from the road with a front garden and driveway access. There is a large, fairly private rear garden and a number of mature trees set within the garden or along the eastern and rear boundaries. Plot is close to crossroads of Merdon Avenue and Kingsway and is adjacent to the Hiltingbury Lakes.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area with a wide variation in house type and design. Typically set back from the road with a mixture of boundary treatments often reinforced by planting. Wide range of alterations and extensions.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/05/54546	Rear conservatory	Permit, 23/08/2005

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/14459/005/00	REPLACEMENT FRONT PORCH	Permit, 05/05/1993
Z/14459/004/00	SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION	Permit, 24/11/1988

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
31 Merdon Avenue	We write to formally object to the above-mentioned planning application on the following grounds: 1. As the neighbours on the west side of the proposed development, our property would be immediately adjacent to the new development. Having examined the plans we consider that the new development would have a significant adverse effect on our residential amenity: I. The enclosed sun path diagram illustrates that the new first floor building will restrict solar gain to our property during the morning and into the early afternoon. This will block light to the side (east side) windows of our ground floor sitting room and will also affect our ability to enjoy our outdoor space. II. The view from the aforementioned sitting room windows will be severely compromised; the new first floor extension will result in a view of very close proximity brickwork from these windows. III. The new first floor extension with north-facing windows will directly overlook our garden resulting in a loss of privacy 2. Although there are other large houses on Merdon Avenue, this would be one of, if not the, largest. In the context of a large plot with space surrounding the building a large house would not be out of character. However, the proposed extension includes extending the footprint of the house as far west as is possible within the confines of the boundary, which would result in this very large house having a very small gap between it and our house. We consider this to be over-development of the site and it would be over-bearing in terms of its visual impact due to a loss of the open-aspect currently present between the two properties 3. We do not object per se to an extension of 29 Merdon Avenue. Considering there are no direct neighbours to the east of the site, development of that side of the property would not affect our residential amenity, or that of others. We are sure that the proposed increased first-floor living area could be accommodated by extending over the current garage with minimal if any impact on neighbours.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CFD	No comment
CRT	I can confirm there are no arboricultural concerns therefore I raise no objection.
CRE	<u>Nature conservation</u> I have read the bat survey submitted with the development and can confirm that this property is of negligible importance for bats and no further investigations are required. Due to the location of the property, adjacent to Hiltingbury Lakes Site of Interest for Nature Conservation, the presence of Priority Woodland birds within the locality and the plans to cut back large shrubs I would advise that an informative ias placed on any permission granted that:-

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	Vegetation is checked for birds nests before any pruning or clearance is undertaken. If bird's nest are found vegetation pruning and/ or clearance must be delayed until chicks have fledged.

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) 59.BE
Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area 1 (Hiltingbury and Hocombe Park Special Policy Area)

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Hiltingbury Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework:

The NPPF carried a presumption in favour of sustainable development (para. 14), which incorporates three elements: economic, social and environmental, (para. 7). Planning law requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, (para. 11). Should a development proposal accord with the development plan, approval should be given without delay, (para.14).

The National Planning Policy Framework highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people, (para. 56) and goes on to state that decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development (para. 58).

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		

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Other … No objections received

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	x	
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

Principle:

The development site is located within the built urban edge, in an established residential area. The general principle of development is therefore accepted, subject to the proposed works being appropriate in nature, scale and design, in compliance with the relevant planning policies and guidance.

In this case, the relevant saved policies are 59.BE and 181.LB. Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan Review 2001-2011 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 181.LB relates to Hiltingbury Special Policy Area, which this property falls within and states that redevelopment of plots will not be permitted unless (amongst other criteria which are not applicable in this case) the proposal does not result in the loss or prejudice the retention of existing healthy mature trees; and the design, siting, size, scale and type of development is compatible with the Arcadian character of the locality.

Character and Street Scene:

The single storey rear extensions, whilst large, are typical of the type of development on residential properties and would have no significant impact on the character of the area, as they are screened from the public realm, and no impact on the neighbouring property due to the height and design.

The two storey side extension, having been amended, is now more subservient to the host property and whilst significantly increasing the size of the property, is not considered to be out of

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

keeping or imposing on the original dwelling.

The amended front porch pulls the host property and proposed extension together, reflecting the hipped roof form and improving the legibility of the dwelling by creating a defined front entrance.

The retention of the existing landscaping and mature tree screening around the plot helps to soften the building and limits views from the public realm. Although the resultant dwelling would be sizeable, it is not considered to be detrimental to the character of the area, nor would it have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

Residential Amenity:

The residents at 31 Merdon Avenue have objected to the original scheme on the grounds of overshadowing and loss of light, loss of a view, and overlooking. They also considered the original scheme to be over-bearing as a result of the loss of space between the two properties.

The proposed two storey extension has the greatest potential to impact the amenity of these residents. The scheme has been amended to reduce the width of the extension, pulling the first floor an additional metre from the side boundary and slightly lowering the ridge height. With regard to loss of light to the siting room, utilising the guidance contained within the Quality Places SPD, there is the potential for light to the two small, high level windows to be diminished. However, these are secondary windows to this room which is dual-aspected and serviced by a large window on the front elevation and patio doors to the rear. As such, it is considered that a reduction in light to these side windows would not result in significant detrimental harm to the amenity of these residents.

With regards to overshadowing of the garden area, again, whilst there is the potential for some overshadowing of the garden area close to the house, there are other examples of two storey structures close to the boundary in the immediate vicinity and on balance, it is not considered this is sufficient to warrant a reason for refusal.

The loss of a view is not a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into consideration.

The rear elevation of the two storey extension provides two first floor windows, one serving the landing and one serving the master bedroom. In a residential area some degree of overlooking is expected, as recognised in the Quality Places SPD and there are first floor windows to the rear in all the properties in the vicinity. It is not considered there is sufficient overlooking to warrant a refusal of this scheme.

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

Highway Matters:

The proposed works increase the size of the dwelling significantly, however there is no real increase in bedroom number, as what is referred to as a ‘snug’ at first floor on the existing floorplans, whilst a small room, would have constituted a small single bedroom originally.

Aside from the existing double garage, there is adequate space on the driveway to accommodate parking, exceeding the Council’s parking standards.

Trees:

Due to the location of the proposed works, no trees are likely to be impacted. The Council’s Tree Services Manager has confirmed there is no objection on tree grounds.

Nature conservation:

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposal 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 required for this development as it falls inside the designated zone of impact.

On balance, it is considered the development complies with the requirements of Policies 59.BE and 181.LB.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft 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 permission, subject to conditions.